

THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF DELINQUENCY

Vol. VII

October, 1956

No. 2

EDITORIAL

Professor Glueck's outspoken criticism of the theory of 'differential association' is timely for at least three reasons: first, as a reminder to criminologists in general—not only to criminologists—sociologists—that a hypothesis may well be useful in stimulating further thought and research, but unless it can be empirically proved it should be abandoned or at least put in cold storage before it becomes a fixed creed seemingly no longer requiring validation and a mere burden to be carried from textbook to textbook; secondly, it is useful in once more underlining the futility of any attempt to discover one single cause of crime; and, lastly, many criminologists who are otherwise sympathetic to modern developments in sociological theory will share Professor Glueck's disinclination to accept the whole of the jargon all too frequently found in recent sociological literature and occasionally taking the place of real thinking. W. I. Thomas was one of the outstanding pioneers in the development of twentieth-century sociology, and, besides his other contributions, his concept of 'definition of the situation' has been very useful to criminological thought also. It can hardly be disputed, however, that in recent years we have been hearing so much of it that Professor Glueck's outcry is well understandable. The same applies to Sutherland's theory of differential association. Although its creator himself stressed that it should not be regarded as 'a complete or universal explanation of white collar crime or other crime' ('White Collar Crime,' p. 234), some other passages in his writings could easily give a different impression of his intentions. It has to be borne in mind, though, that the authors of most other American textbooks of criminology have refused wholesale to accept the theory of differential association and that, as shown in Professor Glueck's quotation from 'Primitive Behaviour', Thomas himself was always willing to admit the significance of psychological factors and to stress the need for

a theory of multiple and cumulative causation or—what is more controversial—even to abandon the idea of causation; ‘the question,’ he wrote, ‘is not *why* but *how* actions follow and relationships obtain.’¹

Obviously, Professor Glueck’s criticism is not meant to be an unreserved declaration of war on sociological interpretations of crime. He is careful to distinguish between certain ‘sociological criminologists who have taken up the ideas of W. I. Thomas’ and the latter himself, and in the eclectic theory of causation for which he pleads there is ample room for the contributions of more than one discipline. How wide the ‘research frontiers in criminology’ actually are is clearly demonstrated in Professor Clinard’s Congress paper with its emphasis on the need not only for more research ‘on the relationship of criminality to social norms, urbanization, and social structure’, but also on ‘replica studies’—a need also underlined by Arnold M. Rose in the book reviewed in this issue—on the study of ‘behaviour systems’ and, particularly welcome in this connexion, ‘for more integrated research between sociologists, on the one hand, and psychiatrists and psychologists on the other’. After all, it is to encourage close and systematic co-operation between these three and all other disciplines concerned with crime and its treatment that this Journal as well as the ‘Scientific Group for the Study of Delinquency Problems’ has been founded.

Starting in a religious atmosphere of reclaiming the fallen into the framework of moral conduct as the basis of social competence, the probation service was soon caught up in the net of sociology, and later of psychology, particularly in its psycho-analytic aspects. Although the advance in appreciation of ætiological factors in delinquent conduct has widened the horizon, each approach seems to have imposed, through its own discipline, a certain rigidity. If we see the delinquent as we may do ordinary persons, in the light of partial functions, we cannot help but impose a spurious objectivity on material which is, not only subjective in part of its nature, but also variable, because of the interpersonal factors which lie at the root of all individual reactions and certainly of delinquency, which is in so many respects an active revolt, at both conscious and unconscious levels, against personal relations ranging from the social to the individual.

In his article on new trends in probation Newton stresses the need to see the probationer not only as an ‘object’ for study, but as a whole person

¹ In his ‘Report to the Social Science Research Council on the Organisation of a Program in the field of Personality and Culture’, apparently first published in Edmund H. Volkart’s ‘Social Behaviour and Personality. Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research’, pp. 289 *et seq.* (New York, Social Research Council, 1951.) See also pp. 18 and 190.

who must enter into relationships *with* a whole person if any progress, *i.e.* therapeutic outcome, can result from the contact. Rigid social and, indeed, psychological concepts, while useful for the investigator when he sits back and contemplates his clinical material, may be fatal in the *vis-à-vis* encounters which constitute the therapy.

A concept useful at first encounter may be useless at the next; therapeutic meetings must have all the qualities of variability, which is of the very essence of life itself. There are, of course, certain basic rigidities which cannot be abandoned even if they are expressed as working rules, such as psycho-analytic notions, or religious dogma, where the social worker co-operates, as he sometimes must, in a particular religious field.

This new trend, as Newton clearly points out, does not abandon the scientific background, but he stresses that persons must be seen against it. The *dramatis personæ* are the probationer and his family and the officer, all acting together to produce the denouement of cure. In a sense, the probation officer involved in a delinquency problem is a kind of character in a psycho-drama—at one time the shadow of the law cast across a family and its delinquent member, and at other times a parent or big brother. And, moreover, in so far as he is conscious of the area in which he moves, he partakes even temporarily of the field properties of this region. Mr. Newton sees in this interpersonal relationship, sometimes alarmingly fluctuating, a very delicate rôle which calls for training and, of course, adequate personality qualities for the task. The view that the probation officer deals only with the individual delinquent is a mistaken view. Neither he nor the delinquent, even as whole persons, is isolated. No man is an island.

There is little to report on the struggle against capital punishment since the Note on recent developments which appeared in the April issue. Mr. Sydney Silverman's Death Penalty (Abolition) Bill, which was carried in the Commons, on a free vote, in March 1956, was rejected in the House of Lords on 10th July, 1956, by 238 votes to 95. The Prime Minister then promised that a statement would be made in the House 'before the ending of the present session', which will be at the end of October or early November. The return of Parliament on 23rd October, to conclude the business of the current session, is now awaited with keen interest. To judge from recent Party Conferences, the issue will lie between Mr. Silverman's supporters and those who favour a Government-sponsored measure retaining the penalty but modifying its conditions of application.

THEORY AND FACT IN CRIMINOLOGY

BY SHELDON GLUECK (HARVARD)

I

Before and after Lombroso published his theory of the 'born criminal' in 1897, there have been attempts to attribute crime to some unilateral cause. Intellectual defect as an exclusive or major explanation followed atavism, degeneracy and epilepsy; mental disease followed intellectual defect; the psycho-analytic concept of criminalism 'from a sense of guilt' followed traditional psychiatric explanations. The older unilateral sociological explanations in terms of poverty, movements of the business cycle and the like, were succeeded by the over-emphasis of residence in economically under-privileged and culturally conflicting 'interstitial' urban areas.

In more recent years, the theory of 'differential association' has been put forward by the late Professor E. H. Sutherland,¹ a distinguished criminologist, and elaborated in Professor D. R. Cressey's new edition of Sutherland's popular text-book on criminology. This theory plays a prominent part in American criminological circles.² The proponents of this view disclaim that they, like their forerunners, are resorting to a unilateral explanation of crime; they do not call differential association a 'cause' but rather a 'theory.' The theory is alleged to explain crime not in terms of a single ætiological influence but rather in terms of many variables which it supposedly 'organizes and relates'.

It is the thesis of this paper that the theory of differential association, supported by its related concept of 'definitions of the situation', fails to organize and integrate the findings of respectable research and is, at best, so general and puerile as to add little or nothing to the explanation, treatment and prevention of delinquency.

Simply stated, the theory explains criminality as the result of an excess of 'definitions favourable to violation of the law over definitions unfavourable to violation of the law',³ learned by the prospective offender in social

¹ For the latest elaboration of this theory, see Sutherland, E. H., 'Principles of Criminology', 5th edition, revised by D. R. Cressey, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1955, Chapter IV.

² Virtually all criminological text-books published in the United States during the past three decades are by dedicated sociologists.

³ Sutherland-Cressey, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

interaction with existing criminals. However, as stated in the text-books the theory is not too clear. One form of explanation (in the quotation that follows) seems to emphasize the individual rather than the *milieu*, and to include, thereby, early childhood experiences and perhaps even original natural endowment of the offender in the bringing about of delinquent behaviour ; but, if this be so, the theory adds nothing but the excess baggage of confusing terminology to what is already well known and explainable without the benefit of the theory :

‘ In another sense, a psychological or sociological sense, the situation is not exclusive of the person, for the situation which is important is the situation as defined by the person who is involved. That is, some persons define a situation in which a fruitstand owner is out of sight as a “ crime-committing ” situation, while others do not so define it. Furthermore, the events in the person-situation complex at the time a crime occurs cannot be separated from the prior life experiences of the criminal. This means that the situation is defined by the person in terms of the inclinations and abilities which the person has acquired up to date. For example, while a person could define a situation in such a manner that criminal behaviour would be the inevitable result, his past experiences would for the most part determine the way in which he defined the situation. . . . The following paragraphs state such a genetic theory of criminal behaviour on the assumption that a criminal act occurs when a situation appropriate for it, as defined by the person, is present.’ ⁴

While it is true that a person’s ‘ inclinations and abilities ’, and his prior experiences influence his latest experience, it is difficult to see what is added to understanding by all this talk about ‘ definitions of the situation.’ It comes down to saying that if a person’s make-up and experiences are such as to incline him to criminalism he will consciously become a criminal—something with which nobody can quarrel except for the unwarranted exclusion of the subconscious and unconscious influences in behaviour. Why place major emphasis on a ‘ definition of the situation ’ which the prospective offender supposedly goes through? The important question is what makes him a delinquent, or, if we must pay tribute to the sociological formula, what makes him define a situation as conducive to criminalism?

But another form of exposition of the differential association theory emphasizes the influence of the *milieu*. We are informed, first, of the discovery that ‘ criminal behaviour is *learned* ’ and that ‘ Negatively, this means that criminal behaviour is not inherited, as such ; also, the person who is not already trained in crime does not invent criminal behaviour, just as a person does not make mechanical inventions unless he has had training

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

in mechanics.’⁵

Consider the first part of this statement. Does anybody nowadays believe that criminal behaviour ‘as such’ is inherited? Did even Lombroso believe so? Those criminologists who call attention to variations in the strength of different hereditary drives and controlling mechanisms do not claim that criminalism *per se* is inherited, but merely point to the too often sociologically underemphasized if not ignored biological fact that, in the eyes of nature, all men are not created equal and that some, because of certain traits useful to the kind of activities involved in criminal behaviour, probably have a higher delinquency *potential* than others.⁶

Consider, now, the second part of the quotation, to the effect that a person cannot invent criminal behaviour or commit crime without training. This is so contrary to obvious fact that it is surprising to see it seriously advanced. It attributes all criminal conduct to indoctrination by other criminals or contagion by criminalistic ‘patterns’ and utterly ignores such primitive impulses of aggression, sexual desire, acquisitiveness, and the like, which lead children to various forms of anti-social conduct before they have learned it from others. What is there to be learned about simple lying, taking things that belong to another, fighting and sex play? Do children have to be taught such natural acts? If one takes account of the psychiatric and criminological evidence that involves research into the early childhood manifestations of anti-social behaviour, one must conclude that it is not delinquent behaviour that is learned; that comes naturally. It is rather *non-delinquent* behaviour that is learned. Unsocialized, untamed and uninstructed, the child resorts to lying, slyness, subterfuge, anger, hatred, theft, aggression, attack and other forms of asocial behaviour in its early attempts at self-expression and ego formation. What he is normally forced to learn in his earliest struggles with the adult environment, in order to develop a personality and win the affection and sense of security and approval he craves, is not the non-conforming behaviour of egoism and delinquency but the conventional behaviour of altruism and non-delinquency; not the expression of natural asocial, dissocial or anti-social impulses and desires, but how to tame these primitive tendencies sufficiently to win parental love and approval. Law-abiding character formation is a

⁵ Sutherland-Cressey, *op. cit.*, p. 77. ‘The differential association theory, which is considered by most sociologists as the best formulation to date of a general theory of criminality, holds, in essence, that criminality is learned in interaction with others in a process of communication.’ Cressey, D. R., ‘The Differential Association Theory and Compulsive Crimes’, *J. of Crim. Law, Criminology and Police Science*, Vol. 45 (May-June, 1954), p. 29.

⁶ See ‘Physique and Delinquency’, by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1956.

hard-won process.

If, as the proponents of the 'differential association' theory insist, 'the person who is not already trained in crime does not invent criminal behaviour just as a person does not make mechanical inventions unless he has had training in mechanics', how account for a basic finding in *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*,⁷ that the onset of delinquent behaviour occurred at the tender age of seven years or less in 44.4 per cent. of the delinquents and at ten years or less in 87.6 per cent.?⁸ These are not theoretical speculations but carefully verified facts.⁹ Just where and when did these very young children 'differentially associate' with delinquents or criminals in order to learn how to commit their delinquencies? True, another finding of *Unraveling* was that 56 per cent. of the delinquents, compared to only three individuals among the non-delinquents, became members of boy gangs;¹⁰ but since nine-tenths of the delinquents were, as has been indicated, committing offences at under eleven years of age, and since the gang is an adolescent phenomenon,¹¹ it cannot be said that the delinquents learned their anti-social behaviour from the gang.

If what is meant by the proponents of the 'crime is learned' school is that most criminals consolidate their anti-social attitudes in contact with others, or learn *techniques* of various crimes from others, there is less objection (although this does not account for the *origins* of misconduct); but even this is exaggerated. We found little evidence in our numerous solidly grounded follow-up studies involving (in addition to the 500 delinquents reported on in *Unraveling*) 1,000 juvenile delinquents and 500 adult reformatory offenders studied over a period of 15 years, as well as 500 female offenders, that the great majority of these criminals would have failed to pass from juvenile delinquency to adult criminalism had it not been for 'differential association', or that they learned their techniques from each other.¹²

⁷ Glueck, S., and E. T., 'Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency', New York, The Commonwealth Fund, 1950. ⁸ 'Unraveling', *op. cit.*, p. 28.

⁹ For a detailed account of method, see 'Unraveling', *op. cit.*, Chaps. II-VII.

¹⁰ 'Unraveling', p. 163.

¹¹ 'The lure of the gang is undoubtedly due in part to the fact that the gang boy is in the adolescent stage which is definitely correlated with gang phenomena. Although this period has no exact limits for any individual, it includes broadly for the boy the years from twelve to twenty-six.' Thrasher, F. M., 'The Gang', Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1936, 2nd Rev. Ed., p. 36. Of some 1,200 cases of gang membership studied in Chicago, only 1.5 per cent. of the boys were six to twelve years old, while 63 per cent. were classified as adolescents. Thrasher, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

¹² '500 Criminal Careers', 1930, New York, Alfred Knopf; 'One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents', 1934, Boston, Harvard University Press; 'Five Hundred Delinquent Women', 1934, New York, Alfred Knopf; 'Later Criminal Careers', 1937, New York, The Commonwealth Fund; 'Criminal Careers in Retrospect', 1943, New York, The Commonwealth Fund; 'After-Conduct of Discharged Offenders', 1945, New York and London, Macmillan Co.

By way of further elucidation of the differential association concept, the crux of this theory is presented in the following words :

'The specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of the legal codes as favourable or unfavourable. In some societies an individual is surrounded by persons who invariably define the legal codes as rules to be observed, while in others he is surrounded by persons whose definitions are favourable to the violation of the legal codes. In our American society these definitions are almost always mixed, with the consequence that we have culture conflict in relation to the legal codes. A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favourable to violation of law over definitions unfavourable to violation of law. This is the principle of differential association.¹³

'The ratio between such definitions and others unfavourable to law violation determines whether or not a person becomes criminal.'¹⁴

Consider these statements. In the first place, has anybody actually counted the number of definitions favourable to violation of law and definitions unfavourable to violation of law, and demonstrated that in the pre-delinquency experience of the vast majority of delinquents and criminals, the former exceed the latter?¹⁵ Indeed, it is highly probable that, by the very extent, frequency and intensity of conventional home and school and church influences, and the very early stage of the development of character at which these influences operate, there is an excess of 'definitions unfavourable to violation of law' even in the case of most of those who become delinquent and criminal.

¹³ Sutherland-Cressey, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

¹⁴ Cressey, D. R., 'Application and Verification of the Differential Association Theory', *J. of Crim. Law, Criminology and Police Science*, Vol. 43 (1952-53), p. 43.

¹⁵ The only systematic check-up I know of, by Cressey himself (and that not involving a count of 'definitions'), resulted in the conclusion that the theory will hardly stand up. Reporting on 65 prisoners in the Illinois State Penitentiary at Joliet, 20 in the California Institution for Men at Chino, and 40 in the United States Penitentiary at Terre Haute, Indiana, who were 'questioned in detail about the acquisition of the techniques and rationalizations' pertaining to their common offence of criminal trust violation, Cressey says: 'On the basis of evidence found in interview materials gathered from these men, the first hypothesis, that the techniques are learned in association with identifiable criminal behaviour patterns, was rejected.' A second hypothesis was supposedly established (partially) on the following reasoning: 'Since a rationalization that one is "borrowing" rather than "stealing" or "embezzling" the entrusted funds, for example, must be learned, it is inconceivable that it could be present unless the individual using it had been in contact with persons who presented it to him or had been in contact with some other cultural source which gave him a general acquaintance with it. . . . It is not possible for trust violators to use rationalizations in the manner indicated without first having come into contact with definitions of situations which to a greater or less degree sanction the criminal violation of financial trust.' . . . However, 'rather than naming a specific source, the subjects referred directly or indirectly to rather general cultural ideologies with which they had informal contact at some vague period in their lives. For this reason, that portion of the second hypothesis which pertains to the identification of the specific sources of the rationalizations was rejected, and a calculation of the differential association ratio could not be attempted.' Cressey, *op. cit.*, pp. 45, 47, 48, 49. It is submitted that the proponents of the differential association theory can derive little comfort from this experiment.

In the second place, the theory in question, by emphasizing a quantitative excess of 'definitions', ignores the patent fact that the individual influences of the human and physical environment to which persons are subjected vary in their impact. But more seriously, it fails to take account of obvious differences in the somatic, temperamental and characterological make-up of individuals subjected to a superficially similar environment.

Those sociological criminologists who have taken up the ideas of W. I. Thomas are not as discerning as was the master. For right at the threshold of Thomas's significant *Primitive Behaviour*, he points out that conditioning is only half the process, the other half being the varied natures of those conditioned; and that these involve both experience and original endowment:

'The reaction of different individuals in the same culture to identical cultural influences will depend partly on their different trains of experience and partly on their biochemical constitutions and unlearned psychological endowments. Local, regional, nationalistic and racial groups are in turn conditioned, in the formation of their behaviour patterns and habits, by their several trains of experience and conceivably by their particular biochemical and psychological constitutions.'¹⁶

He includes, among the problems of individual and group adjustment, the 'capacity and opportunity of the individual to be adjusted (*constitutional* factors, incentives, social position).'¹⁷

But by emphasizing the *number* or *ratio* of 'definitions' as controlling, the differential association theory treats all persons as *equally* influenced by stimuli of one kind or another—something patently contrary to elementary biology and psychology. If the quantitative emphasis of the theory is sound, then, to press it to its logical conclusion, the biggest criminals of all would be professors of criminology, prison guards, and prison chaplains! They certainly spend a great deal of time and effort in numerous instances of 'differential association' with criminals. These persons are not criminal but essentially law-abiding, because of their original endowment and early home influences and training; and to say they 'define the situation' differently from criminals is to add no insight whatsoever to the understanding of delinquency and non-delinquency, but to state, in pseudo-scientific language, the fact that they are not criminally inclined or do not wish to be criminals.

However, the proponents of this theory want to have it both ways. They also tell us that 'differential associations vary in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity.' If these influences vary in these different ways, how

¹⁶ Thomas, W. I., 'Primitive Behavior, An Introduction to the Social Sciences', New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1937, p. 1.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2. Italics supplied.

can one say that it is a mere numerical excess of definitions favourable to criminality that determines the issue? In discussing 'intensity', Professor Cressey says that " 'intensity' is not precisely defined but it has to do with such things as the prestige of the source of a criminal or anti-criminal pattern and with *emotional reactions related to the associations.*" ' ¹⁸ (Italics supplied.) But if this be so, it is not the *stimulus* of the 'differential association' that is crucial but rather the *response* in terms of the emotional reaction of the individual to such stimulus; and this response obviously must vary with differences in the biopsychologic structure of those who make it. What is added to this by the *deus ex machina* of 'definitions of the situation'? How much more illuminating is Dr. Bernard Glueck's formulation: 'A factor is not a cause unless and until it becomes a motive.'

There remains the mention of a significant phenomenon which the 'differential association' and 'definition of the situation' theory fails to explain, and which is rationally explainable on other grounds; namely, the phenomenon of fluctuations in criminality and recidivism with age. Cressey states, among other features, that 'the age of maximum general criminality is probably during or shortly before adolescence', that it varies with type of crime, that 'in general . . . criminal behaviour varies widely with age and sex', that 'the age of concentration of the more violent types of crimes, such as burglary and robbery, has remained relatively constant for several centuries', that 'the crime rate decreases regularly and steadily from the age of maximum criminality until the end of life.'¹⁹

By way of explanation of such phenomena, Cressey considers certain biological views, as follows:

'One of the theories presented as an explanation of the age ratios in crime is that they are due directly to biological traits such as physical strength and vigour: crimes are committed frequently by persons who are strong and active and infrequently by persons who are weak and passive. Another biological theory is that crimes are concentrated in three periods, ages three to six, fourteen to sixteen, and forty-two to forty-five, and that these periods are products of libidinal tides due to changes in the instincts of sex and aggression and to changes in the ego strength. A third biological theory is that inheritance is the direct cause.'²⁰

He does not discuss these views. He disposes of them by this simple *ipse dixit*: 'These biological theories *obviously* [*sic*] provide no explanation of many of the variations in the age ratios in crime; indeed, it may be said that they do not explain even one of the facts outlined above when that fact is considered in its ramifications. On the other hand, all of these facts are consistent with the general theory that crime is a product of social experi-

¹⁸ Sutherland-Cressey, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-9.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 108-9.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 110-11.

ences and social interaction.’²¹ But where is the evidence that the number and/or ‘duration, priority, and intensity’ of ‘definitions favourable to crime’ fluctuates with age, so as to explain the ebb and flow of crime at various biological stages? Cressey claims that ‘the general conclusion from this survey of the facts regarding physical and physiological conditions is that these conditions have not in any case been demonstrated to be a direct force in the production of crime or delinquency. On the contrary, it is *apparent [sic]* that these conditions are related to crime only as they are socially defined and interpreted.’²² How apparent? To whom apparent?

Nobody claims any direct or exclusive relationship between physical characteristics and crime. The difference between the eclectic criminologist and the type of sociological criminologist whose reasoning is reflected above is that the latter evidently argues that original nature means nothing, that all is socio-cultural conditioning, that you can make a silk purse out of a sow’s ear; while the former, basing his views on carefully validated data from biological as well as sociocultural sources, attributes the end-product of criminality to an interplay of various more or less well-defined increments of nature and nurture.

Even well-recognized social processes are dogmatically shaped to fit into the prejudices of the pre-existing theory of ‘differential association.’ For example, in discussing culture conflict between foreign-born parents and native-born children, Cressey adverts to the following facts :

‘Psychiatrists and social workers find these conflicts within the home to be highly significant in emotional disturbances of children, and they feel that the emotional disturbances are conducive to delinquency. Levy has reported that differences in language, manners, methods of discipline, and ideals presented by the parents are important factors in the maladjustment of children.’²³

Is this satisfactory? No. These clear findings which reasonably explain certain behaviour must be forced into the theory of differential association. The quoted passage is followed by this : ‘However, it is likely that culture conflict is significant to delinquency principally as it determines differential associations with behaviour patterns sanctioning violation of American laws pertaining to delinquency.’²⁴ Proof?

We are told that ‘a test of the theory is how well it accounts for all the variations in the values of the variables’²⁵ involved in the etiology of delinquency. Only by assuming the basic fact which the proponents of the differential association theory have not proved—namely, that in the life of all or the vast majority of delinquents and criminals there is an excess of

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 111. Italics supplied.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 115. Italics supplied.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 92-3.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

'definitions of the situation' favourable to criminality—and by assuming that all people react uniformly to the same sociocultural stimuli—something that is patently not true—can this theory be upheld.

Cressey repeats Sutherland's not very persuasive dogma that 'It is not necessary, at this level of explanation, to explain why a person has the associations which he has; this certainly is a complex of many things . . .'²⁶ It most assuredly is necessary to explain it, if 'this level of explanation' is to descend from the clouds; for the 'complex of many things', disposed of in such cavalier fashion, is the very essence of the issue. Without ventilation of this fundamental matter, the theory of differential association as the basic explanation of delinquency is a roof without a house. Here are a few items in this 'complex of many things': We have shown, in *Unraveling*, that 98.4 per cent. of the delinquents sought out other delinquents as companions, while only 7.4 per cent. of the non-delinquents, who lived in similar neighbourhoods, often in the same block and sometimes in the very same house as the delinquents, had companions among delinquents.²⁷ We found that the delinquents had many temperamental and personality traits and early childhood home experiences in common, as well as similar interests distinguishing them clearly from the control group. It is this combination of influences that led them to chum with other delinquents. To say that they were non-delinquents before and only became delinquents because of differential association with other delinquents and because they had 'an excess of definitions favourable to delinquency' is, factually, to put the cart before the horse and to ignore proved relevant differences between the delinquents and controls, in favour of guesses that the former became delinquent because of differential association and an excess of unfavourable 'definitions.'

Incidentally, elsewhere in his text-book, Cressey states that 'practically all juveniles commit delinquencies',²⁸ an assumption requiring the con-

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 79. A similar avoidance of the basic issue is found in another exponent of this theory, Clinard: 'Many here might say, why does one and why not another person engage in delinquent or criminal behaviour when most all persons have been exposed to some contact with deviant norms. At this stage all we can say is something like Sutherland's answer that criminal behaviour varies according to the frequency, intensity, priority, and continuousness of such associations. In the balance of contacts of pushes and pulls one individual may be drawn toward crime and another away from it.' Clinard, M. B., 'Criminal Behaviour is Human Behaviour', *Federal Probation*, Vol. XIII, No. 1 (March, 1949), p. 24. If all that can be said in explanation of criminalistic behaviour 'at this stage' is the foregoing, one cannot avoid the conclusion that the differential association-definition of the situation theory is 'at this stage', in a half-baked stage. It rests on unproven assumptions; and even if they were proven they would deal with but a single minor influence in a complex totality of biocultural influences.

²⁷ 'Unraveling', *op. cit.*, p. 163.

²⁸ Sutherland-Cressey, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

clusion that virtually *all* children 'differentially associate' with delinquents and are subjected to an excess of 'definitions' favourable to misconduct.²⁹ If he means that they are delinquent *before* they 'differentially associate' he is contradicting the Sutherland-Cressey theory.

II

In order to contrast the superficiality of the 'differential association' theory with the facts of life among delinquents as determined by intensive, verified and relevant biological and sociocultural research data, let me indicate those traits and factors (among many others) in *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* which were so highly differentiative of delinquents from non-delinquents as to be usefully embodied in three prediction tables, one of which, that dealing with factors of family life, has thus far been subjected to validation through its application to several other and varied samples of cases, and found to have remarkably high discriminative power.³⁰ The predictive traits derived from the Rorschach ('ink-blot') Test, applied to delinquents and non-delinquents, are the following: *social assertiveness, defiance, suspiciousness, destructiveness* and *emotional lability*. The traits derived from psychiatric examination of the delinquents and non-delinquents are the following: *adventurousness, extroversiveness, suggestibility, stubbornness* and *emotional instability*. The factors derived from the social investigation of the homes of both the delinquents and non-delinquents are:

²⁹ In response to the obvious fact that the 'ecologic characteristics of the interstitial area' could not be the major influence in the etiology of delinquency because even in the worst possible 'delinquency area' of the urban slums the great majority of boys somehow manage *not* to become delinquents, the answering tactic of the extreme environmentalists seems to be to throw all ballast overboard and claim that the great majority, if not *all*, boys are in fact delinquents—a *reductio ad absurdum* clearly without proof to support it and contrary to the published findings of Clifford Shaw and his associates. In 'Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency', Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck were able to find hundreds of *truly non-delinquent* boys residing in the same under-privileged 'interstitial' areas in which the delinquents resided. This is fact, verified by intensive check and re-check from many sources, and not guesswork.

³⁰ Thompson, Richard E., 'A Validation of the Glueck Social Prediction Scale for Proneness to Delinquency', *J. of Crim. Law, Criminology and Police Science*, Vol. 43 (November-December, 1952), pp. 451-70; Axelrad, S. and Glick, S. J., 'Application of the Glueck Social Prediction Table to 100 Jewish Delinquent Boys', *The Jewish Social Quarterly*, Vol. XXX (Winter, 1953), pp. 127-36; Whelan, Ralph W., 'An Experiment in Predicting Delinquency', *J. of Crim. Law, Criminology and Police Science*, Vol. 45, No. 4, November-December, 1954; 'Predicting Juvenile Delinquency', *Research Bulletin*, No. 124, April, 1955, published by Department of Institutions and Agencies, Trenton, New Jersey. Two other validations, one on *adult* sex offenders studied in Sing Sing Prison, reported on by Mrs. I. Brandon, another involving a follow-up of children treated at the clinic of the London County Council, reported on by Dr. Augusta Bonnard, were presented at the meeting of the Third International Congress of Criminology in London, summer of 1955, and will doubtless be published in due course.

discipline of the boy by the father, supervision of the boy by the mother, affection of the father for the boy, affection of the mother for the boy, family cohesiveness.

In order to show how strikingly these traits and factors distinguish delinquents from non-delinquents and are therefore (at least indirectly) causally involved in anti-social behaviour, a few illustrations may be given. 91 per cent. of all the boys whom the Rorschach Test showed to have in their make-up a *marked degree of defiance* were delinquents, while of those in whom this trait was absent only 35 per cent. were delinquents;³¹ 83 per cent. of those who were shown by psychiatric examination to be *markedly stubborn* were delinquents, compared to only 39 per cent. in whom this trait was absent; 72 per cent. of the boys whose paternal discipline of them was *overstrict or erratic* were delinquents, compared to only 9 per cent. of those who were guided by *firm but kindly discipline*; 97 per cent. of the boys who came from *unintegrated families* were delinquents as compared to only 21 per cent. of those who came from *cohesive families*. These are only a few illustrations. Wide distinctions in the incidence of traits and factors were also found in respect to a great many other influences in the make-up and background of the boys in this research.

Can the differential association theory make such meaningful discriminations between delinquents and non-delinquents? Can it be used as a predictive factor?

And just how does the differential association theory account for, integrate and reconcile such established biological differences between delinquents and non-delinquents in the Glueck researches as the statistically significant predominance of mesomorphs in the former and ectomorphs in the latter? Or such temperamental-characterial variations between delinquents and non-delinquents as the predominance in the former of aggressiveness, defiance, emotional lability, impulsivity, to name but a few; or the vital differences in the emotional parent-child relationships of the first few years, such as the lack of parental affection, hostile or erratic disciplinary practices, lack of supervision, family disunity, and other faulty parent-child relationships which were found to be indubitably much more numerous in the families of our delinquents than in those of the control group?

The only integration and reconciliation that the theory under discussion can make of these diverse influences which highly differentiate delinquents and criminals from control groups and some of which vary in their relative weights in different circumstances, times and places is to ascribe everything

³¹ The tests were given by a group of psychologists in Boston and interpreted by two Rorschach experts in New York, without the latter knowing which test protocols came from delinquents and which from non-delinquents.

to differential association and an excess of crime-inducing definitions over law-abiding ones. Just what does such a formula add to understanding? Does it say more than that, if conditions and desires are favourable to crime, persons will resort to crime?

In the *Preface* to his book, Cressey says : 'The differential association theory and alternative theories of crime causation are evaluated in the light of their comparative capacity to "make sense" of the facts.'³² Applying this test, is it not more in accordance with facts, clinical experience and common sense to attribute delinquency to a patterned concatenation of various combinations of the above-listed traits and factors which markedly distinguish delinquents from non-delinquents than to advance as an overall explanation the view that among the boys included in the research in question only those who just happened to have learned the ways of crime from association with other delinquents, or who somehow or other acquired or were subjected to an excess of anti-social 'definitions of the situation', became offenders while the others did not?

The multiple factor method of assigning causal power to a combination of traits and factors which in fact demonstrably distinguishes the vast majority of delinquents from non-delinquents is criticized by the proponents of the differential association theory as not involving a 'theoretical framework.' But as successful validations of the statistical prediction tables based on combinations of relevant factors demonstrate, this approach is unquestionably more realistic and revealing of etiologic involvements than is the cloudy adumbration of a 'theory' the proponents of which are so eager to establish the pre-eminence of nurture in the causal complex as to leave out of account fundamental variations in nature.³³ In attacking the multiple factor theory, it is claimed that researchers who have followed that method presume that each factor is 'independent of all other factors.'³⁴ In the Gluecks' researches on delinquency, this is not true. Not only their synthesis of the most discriminative factors into prediction tables but the following summary of *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* proves that the authors in question fully recognize the *interdependence* of the factors involved :

'It will be observed that in drawing together the more significant threads of each area explored, we have not resorted to a theoretical explanation from the standpoint, exclusively, of any one discipline. It has seemed to us, at least at the present stage of our reflections upon the materials, that it is premature and misleading to give exclusive or even primary significance to any one of the avenues

³² Sutherland-Cressey, *op. cit.*, p. v.

³³ One notable exception is Donald Taft. See his intelligent appraisal of Sutherland's theory, Taft, D. R., 'Criminology', New York, The Macmillan Co., 1942, pp. 284-86.

³⁴ Sutherland-Cressey, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

of interpretation. On the contrary, the evidence seems to point to the participation of forces from several areas and levels in channeling the persistent tendency to socially unacceptable behaviour . . .

'We are impelled to such a multidimensional interpretation because, without it, serious gaps appear. If we resort to an explanation exclusively in terms of somatic constitution, we leave unexplained why most persons of mesomorphic tendency do *not* commit crimes; and we further leave unexplained how bodily structure affects behaviour. If we limit ourselves to a sociocultural explanation, we cannot ignore the fact that sociocultural forces are selective; even in underprivileged areas most boys do *not* become delinquent and many boys from such areas do not develop into persistent offenders. And, finally, if we limit our explanation to psychoanalytic theory, we fail to account for the fact that the great majority of non-delinquents, as well as of delinquents, show traits usually deemed unfavourable to sound character development, such as vague feelings of insecurity and feelings of not being wanted; the fact that many boys who live under conditions unfavourable to the development of a wholesome superego do not become delinquents, but do become neurotics.

'If, however, we take into account the dynamic interplay of these various levels and channels of influence, a tentative causal formula or law emerges, which tends to accommodate these puzzling divergencies so far as the great mass of delinquents is concerned:

'The delinquents as a group are distinguishable from the non-delinquents: (1) physically, in being essentially mesomorphic in constitution (solid, closely knit, muscular); (2) temperamentally, in being restlessly energetic, impulsive, extroverted, aggressive, destructive (often sadistic)—traits which may be related more or less to the erratic growth pattern and its physiologic correlates or consequences; (3) in attitude, by being hostile, defiant, resentful, suspicious, stubborn, socially assertive, adventurous, unconventional, non-submissive to authority; (4) psychologically, in tending to direct and concrete, rather than symbolic, intellectual expression, and in being less methodical in their approach to problems; (5) socioculturally, in having been reared to a far greater extent than the control group in homes of little understanding, affection, stability, or moral fibre by parents usually unfit to be effective guides and protectors or, according to psychoanalytic theory, desirable sources of emulation and the construction of a consistent, well-balanced, and socially normal superego during the early stages of character development . . .

'In the exciting, stimulating, but little-controlled and culturally inconsistent environment of the underprivileged area, such boys readily give expression to their untamed impulses and their self-centered desires by means of various forms of delinquency behaviour. Their tendencies toward uninhibited energy-expression are deeply anchored in soma and psyche and in the malformations of character during the first few years of life.

'This "law" may have to be modified after more intensive, microscopic study of the atypical cases. . . . "A scientific law must always be considered as a temporary statement of relationships. As knowledge increases this law may require modification. Even the natural sciences state all generalizations in terms of probability".'³⁵

³⁵ 'Unraveling', *op. cit.*, pp. 281-82.

Thus the enigmatic question of whether one factor or another 'causes' delinquency is shown to be an unsound one; for, given certain surrounding conditions, internal or external, various combinations of biologic or social factors referred to by criminologists in the past can precipitate anti-social behaviour. A *variety* of causal syndromes can bring about the very same criminalistic behaviour. In one case certain biological ones predominate, in another certain sociocultural ones, in the sense that they apparently contribute the most *weight* in the combination of internal and external forces that culminates in anti-social expression.

Hence, there should be substituted for the notion of specificity or unity of causation (or of cause thinly disguised as 'theory') the concept of internal and external pressures and inhibitions. If the total weight of pressures to anti-social behaviour exceeds the total strength of inhibitory forces, the person commits crime. Theoretically, say, twenty factors of minor pressure (weight) are just as likely to conduce to criminal behaviour as four or five factors of heavy pressure. By substituting this concept of varied forces or energy reaching a point of anti-social discharge, for the insistence upon a certain specific theory or factor, or even syndrome, as inevitably and always conducing to delinquency, we arrive at a conception of *interchangeability* of etiologic traits and factors and thus at a realistic and relatively accurate doctrine of causation. At any time, the person is poised between a natural tendency to egoistic anti-social behaviour and a habit-disciplined tendency to conform to the socio-legal taboos. Biosocial pressures of one sort or another tend to turn the scales in one direction or another. (Of course, the relationship between energy pressure and inhibitory tendency is not usually simple or direct; there are, as a rule, complex intermediary processes). Consequently, it is not mesomorphic constitution, or strong instinctual impulse, or an hereditary aggressive tendency, or weak inhibitory mechanism, or low intelligence, or excessive emotional lability, or marked suggestibility, or an unresolved Oedipus situation, or residence in a poverty-stricken 'delinquency area' or in a region with a tradition of delinquency, or 'differential association' with those already criminal, or an excess of anti-social 'definitions of the situation' or any other biological, social or cultural factor that *inevitably* conduces to delinquent behaviour. Any of these factors alone or in various combinations may or may not bring about delinquency, depending on the balance of energy tendencies at a particular time, in the particular individual involved. In times of great crisis, emergency, poverty, unemployment and the like, many persons will commit crimes who, under normal conditions, would not.

However, as was shown in *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*, certain

factors in combination are found to occur so frequently in the constitution and developmental history of delinquents and so seldom among non-delinquents, that we may legitimately conclude that the *weight* they contribute to the causal scales is very excessive, and usually so, in comparison to that of other influences. This is a realistic conception of causation; for by isolating the biosocial syndromes most *usually* operative in the lives of delinquents and most usually absent in the lives of non-delinquents, it not only adds to understanding of cause and effect but it highlights the traits, factors and areas *most relevant* to prediction, to therapeutic effort in the individual case and to prophylactic effort in general.

It may be that some day variations in the way people conduct themselves will be explainable in the more ultimate terms of differences in endocrine gland structure and function, or of microscopic physico-chemical reactions. However, we can in the meantime reasonably speak of cause-and-effect when we disentangle even the cruder forces at play in inclining persons to one course of behaviour or another, just as chemistry and physics opened the doors to the solution of many problems of nature even before the dawn of nuclear science. The question is, whether such an explanation in the field of our concern brings us closer to an understanding of delinquency and therefore to its control. If it does, then, even though we are dealing with forces which may some day be reduced to more subtle constituents, we have made a stride forward in the understanding and possible management of delinquent behaviour.

III

So much for the contrast between the differential association-definition of the situation theory and our eclectic approach to causation.

What now of the recommendations for the prevention of delinquency that flow from the 'differential association-definition of the situation' theory? They consist essentially of a call for 'local community organization' to cope with the problem! We are told, preliminarily, that 'the policy implied in the earlier chapters . . . is that control of delinquency lies principally in the personal groups within the local community.'³⁶ We are told that 'it was *shown* [sic] that delinquency is explained principally by an excess of delinquent associations over anti-delinquent associations.'³⁷ (Where is the proof that this has been shown?) We are told that 'moreover it was *shown* [sic] that the factor in these local and personal groups which had the greatest significance was the definition of behaviour as desirable or undesirable.'³⁸ (Where is the proof of this showing?) We are then solemnly assured that

³⁶ Sutherland-Cressey, *op. cit.*, p. 609.

^{37, 38} *Ibid.* Italics supplied.

‘the closest approximation to a formula for the control of delinquency that can be made at present is that delinquency must be defined as undesirable by the personal groups in which a person participates.’³⁹ Surely a minuscule mouse, brought forth after all the mountainous labours of ‘differential association’ and ‘definitions of the situation’!

How are these ‘definitions’ of delinquency as ‘undesirable’ to be brought about? Will not this process require a probing into original endowment and parent-child relationships in early childhood, and the moral re-education of adults? Just how helpful in all this are the formulæ of ‘differential association’ and ‘definitions of the situation’? Do they say anything except the obvious fact that people must somehow be made to desire to be good?

The sum and substance of advice regarding crime prevention is stated by Cressey in these words :

‘Policies for prevention of delinquency and crime, therefore, should be directed primarily at these personal groups [the family, school and neighbourhood groups, work or recreational groups, religious groups, or others]. In this sense, control of delinquency and crime lies within the local community. This means, first, that the local community must be the active agency in reducing its own delinquency. The personal groups can be modified through the efforts of local organizations such as the school, the church, the police, welfare agencies, and civic groups; they also can be modified through the efforts of laymen.’⁴⁰

There is nothing in these well-worn generalizations about crime prevention that is attributable, as a novel discovery, to the theory of differential association—definitions of the situation. By contrast, reliable researches, with their solidly verified factual foundations, indicate much more pointedly and specifically the how and why of participation of community institutions in delinquency prevention programmes⁴¹ and in addition indicate the rôle of various forms of psychotherapy and group therapy in a preventive programme, as well as other approaches *relevant to the facts* revealed in the intensive study of several samples of delinquents and criminals and non-delinquents.

All the agencies and methods of crime prevention discussed in the work by Sutherland-Cressey have been suggested by other writers, without benefit of the illumination of the theory of differential association and definitions of the situation. The theory has not enhanced, in the slightest, understand-

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 609-10.

⁴¹ See, for example, Glueck, S. and E. T., ‘Delinquents in the Making’, New York, Harper and Bros., 1952, Chap. XVI, ‘Paths to Prevention’; ‘Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency’ *op. cit.*, pp. 285-89; ‘Preventing Crime’ (Editors), New York, McGraw-Hill, 1936; ‘One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents’, Harvard University Press, 1934, pp. 272-84; ‘500 Criminal Careers’, New York, Knopf, pp. 335-9, and others.

ing of the methods of delinquency prevention. It has the demerit, in comparison with views derived from the researches which meticulously compare the incidence of biopsychological traits and sociocultural factors in the make-up and background of delinquents and non-delinquent matched controls, of *not* integrating and *not* reconciling the variety of delinquency-etiology elements and at the same time of being so abstract and cloudy as not to be useful either in explaining or in controlling delinquent behaviour.

There can be no doubt that science advances most rapidly through the discovery of theories or systems which account for a variety of facts already known and lead in turn to the discovery of new ones. But how does the theory under consideration compare in these crucial respects with Einstein's theory of relativity, or with the Copernican system, or the Newtonian generalization, or the Darwinian insight into the processes of natural selection? One has only to put the question to see how absurdly deficient is the elaborately adumbrated theory of differential association and its accompanying definitions of the situation.

There are evidently criminologists who find such a 'theory' helpful in their thinking. To me it is a superficial and superfluous generalization. The multiple factor approach is much more illuminating and much more in accord with the variety of original natures involved in crime, the variety in kind and intensity of human and physical environmental influences involved in crime, the variety in the behaviour patterns of the acts and mental states and mechanisms embraced in the single legal concept of 'crime.' For this not only recognizes the evident fact of a wide variation in influences, weights and combinations of traits and factors in crime causation: it recognizes, too, that while there is a 'core type' of offender, there is also a variety of subtypes or fringe types. It recognizes that just as the fact of a boy's death, although always the same terminal event, may nonetheless be the result of various preceding sequences of conditions, so the terminal event of persistent delinquency may have in its etiologic background a variety of different sequences leading to the same ultimate result. It recognizes that all behaviour is conditioned by both biological and sociocultural influences.

The foregoing analysis leads to the conclusion that a *wise eclecticism*, guiding research in which investigations, examinations and tests are thorough, and sociocultural data are carefully verified and collated, is still the only promising and sensible credo for the modern criminologist. At all events, neither 'differential association' nor an inadequate conception of human psychology and motivation reflected in the mechanical totting up of the number of 'definitions of the situation favourable to delinquency' as opposed to the number unfavourable to delinquency can satisfy the

researcher who has observed again and again that it is the dynamic interplay of certain discernible, and more or less measurable elements of nature and nurture that best accounts for the phenomena of delinquency and crime. Penetrating theories, which summarize and integrate existing reliable findings and which lead in turn to further discoveries, are highly desirable. But premature theorizings can only act as blinders, excluding or grossly under-emphasizing facts that do not fit into preconceptions and ending up with a thin abstraction that neither integrates nor explains.⁴²

POSTSCRIPT

After the above piece was written, Glaser's recent paper, 'Criminality Theories and Behavioral Images',⁴³ appeared. This attempts to save the differential association theory through assuming that 'association' includes 'identification.' It sets forth a 'differential identification' theory as a 'reconceptualization' of Sutherland's theory. Although more sophisticated, this theory has all the weaknesses of the differential association theory. Like differential association, it is a roof without a house, with little furniture and that little barren. It does not account for the early delinquency of children nor for the criminalism of those adults who steal, commit assaults, rapes or murders on the spur of the moment or 'in the heat of passion.' It does not explain the participation of the numerous biological and sociocultural influences involved in delinquency and criminalism nor account for the variety of causal syndromes which multidisciplinary research shows to be involved in the various types of anti-social behaviour.

The theory of 'differential identification' can be of little practical help in predicting delinquency or recidivism because, standing alone, it does not adequately differentiate between offenders and non-offenders; because there is no proof that most criminals begin their careers by deliberate identification with criminal patterns; and because, in the case of a criminal career, by the time such a person has completely identified with the criminal culture he is already a criminal. Thus the theory is at best tautological.

The theory is inadequate for treatment and preventive purposes, since where identification does play a rôle, it is not so much the fact of identification as the reasons and conditions of identification that are relevant.

⁴² Compare Albert Morris's critique of the theory that the crime rate is a function of the differential between frustration and expectancy of punishment: 'This, and other all-encompassing theories, seem to me of modest value and analagous to trying to develop a theory of ill-health in terms of a high incidence of germs and a low expectancy of sanitary engineering.' Morris, A., 'Homicide: An Approach to the Problem of Crime', University Lecture, April 14, 1955. Boston Univ. Press, 1955, p. 4.

⁴³ Glaser, D., 'Criminality Theories and Behavioral Images', *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. LXI, No. 5, March, 1956, pp. 433-44.

RESEARCH FRONTIERS IN CRIMINOLOGY *

By MARSHALL B. CLINARD (WISCONSIN)

Early studies in criminology, and to a minor extent later ones, emphasized the fact that criminality is related in some mysterious manner to the physical constitution. At other times criminologists have considered those who break the laws of society to be inferior mental types characterized by subnormal intelligence. A few have even regarded criminals as products of economic disadvantage, particularly the effects of poverty. When subjected to rigorous research, using wider and more representative samples, these theories have not been confirmed. It is possible now to conclude that, as a group, criminals cannot be distinguished from non-criminals on the basis alone of their physical constitution, mental intelligence, or economic background.

Some other more profitable theories must be sought. Currently two such explanations have a wide following, the psychiatric on the one hand and the sociological on the other. Psychiatric theory tends to emphasize the emotional background and personality traits of offenders, while sociological theory stresses the rôle of group factors such as social norms, social rôles, and urbanization. Both theories, however, are increasingly seeking to explain criminal behaviour in terms which can best be described as the belief that 'criminal behaviour is essentially human behaviour.'¹ By this is meant that those characteristics which distinguish criminals from non-criminals are not biological or animal in nature, but rather the result of a dynamic process of personality development and human learning.

As criminology turns more and more toward the study of these social psychological factors, new frontiers of important basic research are being encountered. These frontiers are the outcome of directing research to the essentially human nature of the behaviour of criminals rather than their biological nature. They are likewise the result of an increasing appreciation of the possibility of explaining the behaviour of human beings by some

* Paper read at a Plenary Session of the Third International Congress on Criminology, London, September 1955.

¹ Marshall B. Clinard, 'Criminal Behavior is Human Behavior', *Federal Probation*, XIII, 21-6 (March, 1949).

coherent theory rather than a hodge-podge of isolated statistical facts which, unhappily, still appeals to some criminologists. Many of these 'frontiers' are similar to those faced by the social sciences in general in their study of human behaviour. The attitudes and personality traits of criminals are acquired basically in the same manner as any other attitudes and personality traits. To recognize this simple fact much more research is needed in criminology which will apply to this area the theories and techniques of social psychological investigations of the way in which behaviour is learned. All too frequently our research has been done by so-called 'criminologists' as though the attitudes and personality traits of criminals represent something distinct from other types of behaviour. In this connection it is interesting to note that the writings of many criminologists seldom refer to social psychological research on aspects of behaviour other than criminality.

SOCIAL NORMS, URBANIZATION, AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

There is ample statistical evidence to indicate that the incidence and nature of crime, particularly property crime, in a society is fundamentally related to such on-going social processes as changing social norms, urbanization, and social structure. Crimes involving some form of theft, the bulk of our crimes, represent anti-social attitudes toward legal norms protecting property. The study of conflicting norms in a society and the conflict of certain norms with those of the criminal law is basic to criminological research. The success with which some groups, and sometimes a large section of a society, can oppose criminal law indicates that all people do not necessarily view the norms of the criminal law in the same way as the makers and enforcers of the law.

Urbanization should be a basic frame of reference for studying crime, particularly property crime, for it represents a way of life which is favourable to the development of criminal behaviour. Among other things, urbanization is characterized by an emphasis on different conceptions of what constitutes correct behaviour, excessive mobility, acquisition of status through material possessions, and impersonal attitudes toward other persons with resulting opportunistic behaviour toward them. Under urban conditions the control of behaviour is being transferred to formal social institutions such as the police and courts. It is obvious that this newer form of living in an urban world leads to increased anti-social behaviour including crime, unless there are efforts to control some of the aspects of such a way of life. It is not only untrue but naïve to say, as some do, that these urban forces are unimportant in explaining criminal behaviour because all persons living under urban conditions are not criminal. Even under the most urban conditions contrary non-urban forces are operating, and there are anti-

criminal norms impinging upon the individual. Those who claim in their research that this is not the case have either not actually studied the problem or have failed to interpret the data adequately.

The impact of changes in society on criminality is being seen throughout the world, wherever new social norms are being introduced and urbanization is increasing. The delinquency and crime of our great American cities, with their diversity of social norms and urbanized living, are but forerunners of similar world-wide problems. The growth of urbanized life in Africa and Asia has, for example, brought with it increases in crime and delinquency. In the United States crime rates increase directly with the size of the city, and almost everywhere throughout the world the crime rates of cities are much greater than rural areas. In the light of such evidence it is difficult to see how most delinquency and crime can be entirely explained by theories of individual inadequacy.² In any given society social structure is characterized by class and occupational divisions. The relationship of crime to social structure has, as yet, received only passing interest. As Aubert has indicated, the chief significance of crimes committed by businessmen and similar groups of white-collar criminals has been that it is symptomatic of the diversity of status systems in present-day social structures.³ Not only does white-collar crime differ from ordinary crime in the methods of dealing with crime, but also in the status of the offender, the toleration of the public, and the social support of the offenders.

Among the most provocative statements of the relationship of social structure to criminality has been that by Merton in his analysis of *anomie*.⁴ He has suggested that crime is a symptom of the dissociation in a society between culturally prescribed aspirations and socially structured avenues for realizing these aspirations. Every culture has incentives for success which are, in turn, restricted by the culture and the social structure. When a given society bases its status system on the achievement of power and material wealth, with few opportunities for vertical class mobility, great pressure is put on the lower social strata to achieve power and wealth through means which may not be acceptable to others in the society such as

² Recently I had the personal experience of driving my car through a large part of Europe. It was interesting to see how my property was considered relatively safe in some countries and not in others, in some cities within a country and not in others, and most interesting of all, how a few miles of driving brought relative safety from auto theft and larceny which had been greatly feared in other areas.

³ Vilhelm Aubert, 'White Collar Crime and Social Structure', *American Journal of Sociology*, LVIII: 263-271 (Nov., 1952). Also see his 'Priskontroll Og Rasjoner-ning' (Oslo: Institute for Social Research, 1950).

⁴ Robert K. Merton, 'Social Structure and Anomie', Chapter IV in *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1949).

ordinary crime, vice, and racketeering. Somewhat the same idea has been suggested by Cohen who has said that lower-class delinquent gangs are essentially the result of lower-class boys being judged in school or other places by middle-class standards.⁵ More research is needed on the relationship of criminality to social norms, urbanization, and social structure.

REPLICA STUDIES

It is not clear at the present time whether or not it will be possible to develop universal generalizations in criminology beyond a very few which are not limited by specific samples from a particular society. This is an issue not only in criminology but in sociology in general and in social psychology. Much criminological research may turn out to be more descriptive of a particular society than universal generalizations. Whether or not this is the case will depend largely upon the development of extensive criminological research in many countries and also upon the nature of this research. Variations in the incidence and nature of crime in different societies suggest the need for comparative studies in criminology using similar hypotheses and research techniques. All too frequently criminologists within a given country, and more often in different countries, in their investigations use their own unique or national way of doing things. Consequently there are differences in hypotheses, research procedures, and even the quality of statistical analysis. While two criminological studies may be made of criminal offenders in different countries, they may have been done in such different ways that they cannot be compared. In other cases certain areas of theoretical interest, such as the influence of companions or neighbourhoods on the development of criminal behaviour, may be explored in a study in one country and totally neglected in a study of delinquent or criminal behaviour in another. This means that while the physical sciences have developed their theoretical knowledge through numerous repetitions of an experiment under different conditions, the science of criminology is being built out of studies whose findings are often restricted to that particular sample, culture, or time. To develop an adequate science of criminology more comparative studies are needed using theories and procedures derived from one society and applied as exactly as possible to another. Likewise, there is need for the repetition of studies within a culture by a different observer using similar methods but perhaps after a lapse of some time. The type of comparative research proposed here is somewhat different from attempting to make merely statistical comparisons or to compare statistically a number

⁵ Albert K. Cohen, 'Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang' (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955).

of limited and superficial characteristics of offenders such as sex and age. International comparisons of countries with different laws and procedures are difficult, moreover, and are much easier to make if the interest is chiefly the way in which criminal behaviour develops irrespective of legal differences. Perhaps this suggestion can best be clarified by citing two examples of actual attempts at replication. Some fifteen years ago I made a study of the relationships of urbanization to criminal behaviour using inmates in an American reformatory. Several papers on this study were published, including one of the few on rural offenders.⁶ Recently a doctoral dissertation in America repeated this study as exactly as possible using the same hypotheses, procedures, and questionnaires.⁷ During the past year I have been in Sweden where I have been engaged in a comparative study of the incidence, nature, and theories of crime there. One of the things I tried to do was to repeat one of my studies in America, this time in a different culture. Sweden is an excellent country to compare with America, for while it is extremely industrialized and has several large cities, its population is more homogeneous and it has not had a war for nearly 150 years. The questionnaire I had used in America was translated into Swedish, a similar sample of young inmates was selected, and the questionnaire was administered as much in the same way as possible. As a result, there is now available data, although not as yet analysed, on Swedish offenders which relate to American hypotheses about crime and can be compared with an American sample, if not completely, at least far more than was previously possible. Not only do we need comparative data on urbanization, but in other areas of criminological research as well. At the present time we stress the need for common procedures in the prevention and treatment of recidivism throughout the world without knowing what differences there might be between the offenders from various countries. Several criminologists working together might be able to devise a questionnaire or interview schedule which could be used in gathering data on offenders in various countries and regions.

THE NATURE OF A 'CRIME'

The fact that a criminal is a person who has committed a crime may seem to be quite a sufficient definition to most persons. Actually the definition of a criminal cannot be scientifically clarified until it is clear what

⁶ Marshall B. Clinard, 'The Process of Urbanization and Criminal Behaviour', *American Journal of Sociology*, XLVIII, 202-13 (September, 1942). Also see 'Rural Criminal Offenders', *American Journal of Sociology*, L, 38-45, July, 1944.

⁷ Harold D. Eastman, 'The Process of Urbanization and Criminal Behavior: A Restudy of Culture Conflict', Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Iowa, August, 1954.

is meant by a 'crime'. Without an adequate working concept of a crime the scientific study of criminal behaviour is built on an unsound foundation, for the term 'criminal' cannot be used without reference to the 'norm' of a crime.

The historic and even adventitious nature of which social norms become crimes and which do not should always be recognized in criminological research. In any society many acts were once crimes which are not to-day, crimes to-day may not be so to-morrow, and there will be crimes in the future which are not so to-day. There are variations in what acts constitute crime not only between countries but even between, for example, States in the United States. Recognizing this fact, Mannheim has suggested that the values involved in the criminal law should be studied to discover which ones should be protected by the criminal law and which left to other agencies.⁸

Until the past decade or so little attention had been given to a definition of a 'crime' which would meet some of the objections resulting from its restriction to the criminal law. As Sutherland pointed out in his pioneer paper on white-collar crime fifteen years ago, if criminals are to be so restricted, then it is likely that criminology will be studying not law breakers but a group biased in age, economic opportunity, education, and many other characteristics of a particular social class.⁹ In his later book on *White Collar Crime* (1949),¹⁰ and in my book on *The Black Market: A Study of White Collar Crime* (1952),¹¹ the proposal was made that criminological research should employ a broader definition, namely not only violations of the criminal but also those of administrative and civil law. Violators of the criminal law are more likely to be drawn from the lower socio-economic classes, while those occupational and economic groups with higher economic status tend to be violators of different types of laws. Others such as Hartung, Lane, and Aubert have also contributed to this broader concept.¹² Actually a crime should be more appropriately defined, for criminological research

⁸ Hermann Mannheim, 'Criminal Justice and Social Reconstruction' (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946).

⁹ Edwin H. Sutherland, 'White Collar Criminality', *American Sociological Review*, V, 1-12 (February, 1940).

¹⁰ Edwin H. Sutherland, 'White Collar Crime' (New York: The Dryden Press, 1949).

¹¹ Marshall B. Clinard, 'The Black Market: A Study of White Collar Crime' (New York: Rinehart & Co., 1952).

¹² Frank Hartung, 'White Collar Offenses in the Wholesale Meat Industry in Detroit', *American Journal of Sociology*, LVI, 25-32 (July, 1950); Robert E. Lane, 'Why Business Men Violate the Law', *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 44, 151-65 (July-August, 1953), and Aubert, *op. cit.*

purposes, as the violation of any law which is punishable by the State. My research on price and rationing violations in the United States during World War II indicated that in thousands of almost identical violations administrative measures and civil measures were sometimes used by the Government, at other times criminal prosecution.¹³ It was difficult to distinguish, as Hartung has also shown, the seriousness of the case by the type of penalty used. Research in the area of white-collar crime, namely crimes committed by businessmen, politicians, professional men and others in connection with their occupations, has still not been extensive. If there were more studies some of the theories of crime based on family difficulties, emotional insecurity, Freudian complexes, or body types might suffer needed revision.

Such a broader definition of the field of interest of the criminologist is heretical to some.¹⁴ There is some question as to whether even scientific understanding of violations of norms punishable by the political state is adequate. The violation of norms of countless other social institutions, in addition to governmental, results in some sort of sanction. For example, industrial and business organizations punish those who violate expected norms, sometimes even by dismissal. Professional groups such as lawyers and doctors may take drastic action against those who violate their canons of proper conduct. Future criminological research will undoubtedly study those who violate formal controls, whether the controls are imposed by the State or otherwise. In addition, research studies will also cover those situations where compliance with norms is secured through positive sanctions or rewards.

BEHAVIOUR SYSTEMS

Writers in criminology have increasingly recognized that the term 'criminal', when applied as a collective term, is too broad to have much meaning. Instead of speaking of criminals as a group, an analysis and description of types of offenders is needed. These interests were quite common in the early days of criminology. Such an analysis of types of offenders means the study of behaviour systems in crime and the way in which they arise.

The distinguishing features of a criminal behaviour system are the social rôles the person plays, the degree of identification with crime, the offender's

¹³ Clinard, 'The Black Market: A Study of White Collar Crime', *op. cit.*

¹⁴ Cressey has recently suggested that we might begin our efforts to find a more suitable basis for criminological research by regrouping legal definitions of crimes into more homogeneous sociological entities based on behaviour. Donald R. Cressey, 'Criminological Research and the Definitions of Crimes', *American Journal of Sociology*, LVI, 546-51 (May, 1951).

conception of himself as a criminal, his patterns of association with others who are criminal or non-criminal, continuation and progression in crime, the way in which offences are committed, his personality traits, and the degree to which criminal behaviour has become part of his life. Criminal behaviour in such an approach is considered a product of social interaction in which the behaviour of an individual has meaning in relation to other persons.

This type of research is sharply different from research on legal categories of criminals or psychiatric personality types. Typological classification of criminals by psychiatrists generally represents broad psychiatric syndromes of personality traits. Such types all too frequently result merely in labelling an offender with some type of terminology rather than clearly indicating the process through which the illegal behaviour developed. Consequently, a single personality type may be applied to individuals with great variation in their careers both in the nature and seriousness of the criminal behaviour. Moreover, psychiatric classifications in terms of personality characteristics neither distinguish types of criminal careers, nor distinguish criminals from non-criminals. In many cases, perhaps, ministers and murderers, wardens and inmates, criminologists and criminals fall within the same personality classification.

The study of behaviour systems in crime, which is still a large frontier, differs also from the statistical manipulation of a group of factors in which there is the hope that a theory will develop from the accumulations of a large number of facts. Although this is quite popular to-day there is little evidence that such random experimentation has produced great results in the physical sciences, and the past has shown the unprofitable nature of such research on human behaviour. Among the studies of behaviour systems which have been made are Sutherland's well-recognized study of the development of a career in professional crime and, more recently, Cressey's study of the behaviour system involved in violations of trust such as embezzlement.¹⁵ Cressey claimed to have found no exception, in his study of trust violators, to the process he described. It consisted of three parts, the first being the opportunity to violate a trusted position and the presence of a non-shareable financial problem. 'Trusted persons become trust violators when they conceive of themselves as having a financial problem which is non-shareable.' He found a wide variety of such types of situations including problems

¹⁵ Edwin H. Sutherland, 'The Professional Thief' (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937). Also, Donald R. Cressey, 'Other People's Money: A Study in the Social Psychology of Embezzlement' (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953). (See the review in *Brit. J. Delinq.*, Vol. VI, p. 64.—ED.).

arising from personal failure, business reversals, ascribed obligations, physical isolation, status gaining and employer-employee relations. In all cases such problems were solved secretly, since the approval of the trust violator's group would have been lost if he had revealed his problem. Second is the knowledge of how to violate. Those who become trust violators are 'aware that this problem can be secretly resolved by violation of the position of financial trust.' Third is the acceptance of verbalizations or rationalizations 'which enable them to adjust their conceptions of themselves as trusted persons with their conceptions of themselves as users of the entrusted funds or property.' Among such rationalizations were beliefs that the violation was actually 'borrowing' or that their violations of trust were justified by 'unusual circumstances.'

In some types of criminal career, particularly where there is recidivism, there are indications that an offender may have been seriously affected by his conception of himself and the nature of the offender's relation with law enforcement officers and institutional treatment. The labelling of a person as a 'delinquent' or a 'criminal' is largely a product of arrest, conviction, and commitment. This label affects the person's conception of himself, for as Tarde once indicated, a criminal is not made by the act but by society's reaction to the act. That this influence is important in recidivism is indicated by the large percentage of first offenders who receive institutional treatment and become repeaters as compared with what appears to be a large number of unapprehended offenders who do not continue to violate the law.

Much more research needs to be done on the relationship of such factors as the self-conception of an offender before and after incarceration, and that of society toward persons who have been incarcerated, if we are to learn how to terminate a criminal career successfully. Mere statistical manipulations, as in prediction studies, by themselves are insufficient to give the proper answers. The dynamic aspects of a criminal career in all its social psychological aspects must also be studied.

Incarceration in a correctional institution affects the self-conception and, for lack of a better term, the 'society conception', of an offender. When like are put with like, as in the case of young offenders, and they are set apart from the rest of society, an inmate society is built up which is difficult to break through. To break through this world of the inmate and alter his attitudes and personality traits is the most important single aspect of a successful correctional programme. There are indications that even small, specialized correctional institutions do not necessarily accomplish this result, but instead may sometimes give the individual even greater opportunities to develop, through more intimate association with others like himself, anti-social ideas

about himself. I have observed, for example, in Scandinavian correctional institutions, which are generally quite small, the extensive self-tattooing which a large percentage of the offenders inflict upon themselves after incarceration. It seems to me that such tattooing is an excellent illustration of the norms of an inmate world as well as their self-conception.¹⁶

The 'scientific' manipulation of offenders in a correctional system, however small, moving them here and there, from one cottage to another or one institution to another, according to changes in classification, may in the end intensify many offenders' ideas of themselves as anti-social persons who are tough and set apart from others. Perhaps more effort should be directed at establishing correctional treatment in association with non-criminals both through improved probation and parole, the use of probation hostels, working in private employment outside the institution, and the establishment of institutions such as special industrial plants where both incarcerated offenders and non-offenders could work together.

CONTROL GROUPS

Data about the characteristics of criminals do not give us information that these factors are related to criminal behaviour until they have been compared with the frequency of such data in the non-criminal population. Exactly whom to use for this non-criminal group presents many difficult research problems, particularly when there are indications that there is extensive undetected and unprosecuted delinquency and criminal behaviour. Control groups of non-offenders have consisted, for example, of non-delinquent siblings (Healy and Bronner), non-criminal brothers (Gillin), from the same school or area (Shaw and McKay), and matching on several factors (the Gluecks). Of these groups, members of the same family are probably the least adequate because they are not necessarily of the same peer generation. In using a control group it is necessary to do as much with it as the original group. This means that the research work is virtually doubled. Without intensive effort one is not sure, for example, whether the control group is actually non-delinquent or non-criminal or what the influences were to which it had been exposed. Where matching is done the items selected often have little or no relation to criminological theory and the matching could as well have been on other extraneous data. In Witmer and Powers' study, however, they had an experimental and control group of offenders and used not only the usual taxonomic characteristics of age and intelligence but

¹⁶ This self-conception is particularly clear in those cases where they tattoo certain anti-social symbols or phrases which signify this conception.

measures of personality adjustment and delinquency prognosis.¹⁷

One difficulty in matching is that if an item is not adequately analysed after matching, unwarranted assumptions may be made that it has an 'equal influence.' This was done by the Gluecks in *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*,¹⁸ where the delinquents were matched on age, intelligence, ethnic origin, and residence in underprivileged area. While the data indicate that the difference in the way the neighbourhood was experienced was crucial, there was little emphasis on this because by matching they assumed that the neighbourhood was experienced in the same way by both delinquent and non-delinquent groups. If they had matched the type of family they would probably have developed an opposite conclusion from that which they reached as to its importance.

In the comparison of control groups the significance or non-significance of differences is usually based on statistical means. There are few studies which have tried to explain the great variations *within* each group. In studies of delinquency such as *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* one may find an overlap of 10 per cent. to 30 per cent. between delinquents and control groups on categories such as the personality and social characteristics of the two groups.

Because most of the comparisons of criminals and non-criminals have been based on *ex-post facto* designs, comparing those who have already been treated by society as criminal or delinquent with those who have not, their reliability is open to much question. Among the difficulties of comparing criminals with non-criminals are (a) individuals with a history of delinquency and criminality have often been affected socially and psychologically by such experiences, particularly if they have been incarcerated in an institution, (b) the data on the control groups, because they have not often been studied before, are rarely as adequate as for the delinquent or criminal groups, (c) the use of information that must be recalled means that experiences, particularly of a delinquent nature, may be remembered by the delinquent group much better than by the other. This means that in order to overcome some of the difficulties in securing adequate control groups, much information might more properly be secured *prior* to delinquency and criminal behaviour. Information about, for example, personality traits, if secured in advance, might help to avoid the possible modifications in personality arising from the differential effect of arrest, court procedures, or institutional

¹⁷ Helen Witmer and Edwin Powers, 'An Experiment in the Prevention of Delinquency' (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951).

¹⁸ Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, 'Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency', (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950).

treatment on those who have experienced this treatment as compared with those who have not. Hathaway and Monachesi did something like this in their delinquency study.¹⁹ They collected data and gave a personality test to a large sample of school-children and then followed them up two years later. Out of 4,048 tested they found 591 children had appeared before the police and these were then classified as to whether the delinquent behaviour had occurred before the testing, after the testing, or continuously before and after the testing.

INTEGRATION OF SOCIOLOGICAL AND PSYCHIATRIC RESEARCH

So far, there have been few criminological studies in which sociologists and those with a psychiatric or psychological viewpoint have jointly participated. This has been the case even in a large staff research project, such as the Glueck's *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* on which, unfortunately, there were no sociologists. This has meant that each discipline has proceeded largely independently with its own research point of view, which has made it difficult to synthesize what appear to be contradictory findings.

Profitable joint research has been carried out by psychiatrists and sociologists in the United States on the problem of mental illness which could well be extended to criminology.²⁰ Each discipline can make a contribution. Psychiatrists and psychologists in their research have magnified the importance of personality traits and motivations in criminal offenders and they have often had more adequate training than sociologists in these areas. On the other hand, sociologists have regarded delinquency and criminal behaviour as a product of definition of situations acquired through group and cultural experiences. To them, norms of behaviour, ideas and beliefs are less individual and more of a group nature, concepts of right and wrong being acquired from others in the on-going process of living. Consequently, sociologists are interested in the rôle a person plays in groups with deviant norms and the differential self-conception a person secures from others. In general, the sociologist is sceptical of individualistic explanations of most delinquent and criminal behaviour based on emotional insecurity, psychopathy, or similar concepts. There is ample research evidence that a large proportion of offenders do not have such characteristics. Although this joint research should be tried, it may be that little may come of it. Rather, it may

¹⁹ Starke Hathaway and Elio Monachesi, 'Analyzing and Predicting Juvenile Delinquency with the MMPI' (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1953).

²⁰ See, for example, studies at Yale University by Hollingshead and Redlich, and the study by Joseph W. Eaton and Robert J. Weil, 'Culture and Personality Disorders' (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955).

turn out that each discipline can contribute more by restricting its research to certain types of offender. The psychiatrist may well contribute an understanding of those offenders who have committed offences against persons such as murder, assault, and sex offences, or those other offenders who are definitely mentally ill. The sociologist may best explain with his theories those offenders who steal or commit similar property offences, all of which, as a group, constitute nearly 95 per cent. of all felonies in America. At the present, actually most of the research being done by each discipline is confined to these particular groups.²¹ Each, however, has glibly generalized their findings to all 'criminals.'

SUMMARY

There are several other frontiers of research in criminology, such as the need for research in a number of specific areas. The ones discussed here happen to be of a more general and probably more fundamental nature. To summarize, they have been :

(1) Need for study of the relationship of criminal behaviour to the general society, including particularly social norms, urbanization, and social structure.

(2) Need for more comparative studies in criminology using similar hypotheses and research techniques.

(3) Need for determining what constitutes the subject matter of criminology, including the nature of a 'crime.'

(4) Need to do research on criminal careers or behaviour systems rather than merely statistical associations. In the case of incarceration research on its effect on self-conception and society's conception of the offender.

(5) Need for more adequate control groups in criminological research and recognition of some of the difficulties.

(6) Need for more integrated research between sociologists, on the one hand, and psychiatrists and psychologists on the other.

²¹ Alfred K. Lindesmith and Warren H. Dunham, 'Some Principles of Criminal Typology', *Social Forces*, 19, 309-11 (March, 1941).

TRENDS IN PROBATION TRAINING

BY GEORGE NEWTON (LONDON)

The selection and training of Probation Officers perhaps reflects as well as anything else the changing emphasis in probation casework. It is generally known that the modern probation service grew out of the work of the Police Court Mission which sent its agents into the London Courts. These founder fathers were missionaries in the true sense of the word and they used the methods of missionaries—changing behaviour by changing feeling—through ‘conversion’. Their methods were persuasion, exhortation and support. They strengthened weak resolution by administering solemn pledges to renounce drink; they gently admonished the sinner while at the same time they offered him the helping hand of friendship; they advised him for his own good; they assisted him in many ways to improve his social and economic condition; and finally they prayed for guidance for him and for themselves. These men believed in the supreme importance of the individual to God and the parables of the lost sheep and the prodigal son were their casework manuals.

With the growth of social science training and the shift of responsibility for selection of Probation Officers from the Police Court Mission and other religious bodies to committees of lay Justices and now, at the student stage, the Home Office Probation Advisory and Training Board, the qualification requirements have become differently expressed and different in fact. Generally, the movement has been from the explicit religious sense of dedication, through ‘practical common sense’ with a sense of vocation, to the person with a sense of vocation who had or could be provided with social science training. This last might be either at a University or at a training centre sponsored by the Home Office.

With the growth of the social services the work of manipulating the environment became much easier and the efforts of Probation Officers turned in the direction of helping people to find and make use of the community service appropriate to their needs. The age of scientific interest dawned and the magic of the I.Q. shone all around. The environment was studied and assessed and, if found lacking, changed. It was fashionable to talk about being ‘objective in one’s approach’ and this was understood to mean a somewhat cold mechanistic approach, but was in fact rarely achieved by its

most ardent exponents. Emphasis was on 'the treatment' carried out according to 'the plan' based mainly on a sociological theory of causation. Although students from Universities were often well aware of the theories of unconscious motivation, these remained theories because they had so few opportunities of seeing their practical application. For many, such knowledge remained academic in the sense that, so far as they could see, it did not seem to serve a useful purpose in helping people. Left with this insecure grasp of such an important area of learning, they often found that 'psychological talk' was the surest way to arouse the amusement of both colleagues and magistrates; they were indeed lucky if this was all it aroused; in any case they were soon aware that 'facts not theories' were what was usually demanded in court.

Psycho-analytic psychology was only one of the many short psychology courses offered to students by University Social Science Departments, and it is not surprising that 'psychological' came to mean anything for which reasons were obscure and at one time was used both as a justification and a condemnation of work which differed, in any way, from the 'common sense' approach. Students from social science courses did know a great deal about comparative psychology, about intelligence and personality testing and were often fascinated by, and therefore full of, experimental psychology. They came into their first job with detailed information about the number and size of electric shocks necessary to make a rat respond to the name of Michael—but with little idea of how to help their first probationer respond to themselves. This is not to discredit the tremendous contribution social science training has made to the development of probation work. However, so far as psychological teaching is concerned it could be argued that students were, and are now, left with the human being in bits and never shown him as a whole person, thinking and acting as a whole person. Once on the job they have to deal with whole people and, in the Probation Service, with extremely difficult 'whole people', so it is perhaps not surprising that so much effort was concentrated on altering the environment in the hope of bringing about change. In fact bigger and better manipulations resulted and it was customary to be told: 'It's not what you know but whom you know that counts in this job.' The conduct of the relationship changed little but the variety of things done to the probationer changed much. Some students whose reading had led them to think of help in terms of personal insight and interpretations found themselves without skill in this form of therapy and after their initial failures to 'get results' gave up, although fortunately many never lost their interest in dynamic psychology. Others fell back on their social training and general experience of meeting and dealing with people

in fashioning their techniques in supervising probationers.

Many were dissatisfied with this state of affairs and were concerned that they were falling far short of the ideal they had set themselves at the beginning of training. They regarded the use of services or manipulation of environment as only part of the contribution they should have been making and felt that the job of improving personal adjustments by helping probationers to make improved relationships with others was of major importance. However, the provision of a University course of professional training which would provide opportunities for the integration of theory and practice was still some years away when the Younghusband report on the Employment and Training of Social Workers was published by the Carnegie Trust in 1947.¹ The important needs of serving officers were also unmet except by the expensive and painful training method of trial and error, and there was much of both! The skills of interviewing, necessary for a Probation Officer, were not examined and remained, for the most part, cloaked under the blanket of confidentiality. Officers in training were allowed to observe more experienced officers conducting interviews. Generally, however, any attempt to discover the rationale and technique of interviewing or the conduct of the relationship between Officer and probationer was met by the statement that the personality of the officer was all important. This may be true, so far as it goes—but its teaching possibilities are distinctly limited. Because the personality of the officer has in fact been the major element in probation practice from the very beginning, there has been tremendous variety in the kind and quality of work done by different officers even within one office.

The Service has clung to the early description of its responsibilities, 'to advise, assist and befriend'; these words are fortunately capable of wide interpretation and are now used to describe work which can range from highly skilled therapy with a strong psychiatric flavour and focused on the probationer's unconscious, to 'rescue' work with a strong emphasis on manipulation of circumstances and environment, without much consideration of either the probationer's conscious or unconscious wishes. Between these extremes come the majority of Probation Officers who might fairly be said to meet their responsibilities to the probationer and to society in two ways. The first is an attempt to relieve economic need where this is necessary, either directly by financial assistance or indirectly with the help

¹ It was not to become reality until 1954 when the first students were enrolled for the course of applied social study at the London School of Economics. The Carnegie course, or Generic Casework course as it is more commonly described, is now offering such training opportunities.

of some other community service including the Employment Exchange, and so to equip a probationer to relieve his own economic needs. The second, by persuasive argument, encouragement, straight talking, exhortation and suggestion, attempts to change the direction of the probationer's behaviour towards an honest and industrious life, and, finally, to enforce a measure of control and a checking-up authority in order to prevent unlawful behaviour.

The authority of the law for which they work has a disturbing effect upon many officers' own feelings about authority. That this has bothered the Service for a long time is clear from the confusion of thinking around the concept of dual loyalties to court or client. As each officer has so far been left to find his own solution it is not unnatural to find some taking on the authoritarian rôle of defenders of society and others the indulgent big brother rôle. This is no reflection on officers but points to some of the difficulties of the setting which called for examination so that help could be given to those entering the Service. Until recently training did little to help with this kind of problem and often what casework theory officers had acquired seemed inappropriate to this job.

Although much that was of value in training was lost or seemed not useful, inevitably much remained to enrich the developing Service. However, good casework was regarded as the special gift of the few—a kind of 'S' factor possessed by certain personalities. Those who had it did little to discourage this kind of thinking, while those who had not strove desperately to suggest that they had—especially to their senior officers and inspectors of the Home Office! As the job is difficult and, if it is to be successful, makes high intellectual, emotional and physical demands and because case-loads have always been fairly high, great emphasis has come to be laid on being mature, capable and independent—on being adequate for the job in fact. When it is remembered that confirmation of appointment is dependent, in part, on the opinion of others often following very different professional paths, and when we remember that the law is based on the assumption of *mens rea* and that behaviour is rationally determined, it is perhaps not surprising that the direction which many new officers take is towards a 'rational common sense approach.' Nor is it surprising that a tenuous understanding of the irrational elements of human behaviour suffers tremendous setbacks in the struggle to appear adequate by confirmation date. Nevertheless the very nature of the material with which Probation Officers have to work has forced back attention on irrational behaviour. In attempting to understand better the oddities of delinquent conduct some Probation Officers have turned their attention to the motivating forces of behaviour.

In this search, with the help of dynamic psychology, an old half-understood truth has been restated, *i.e.* that feelings influence behaviour and that how a person under stress feels about his situation or himself will influence what he does, how he does it, and how he will allow others to help him. Greater awareness of these facts has begun to change the whole thinking about work with people. If one can become aware of the feelings behind the behaviour, then the behaviour has meaning; if one can change the feeling the expression changes too. The emphasis of probation work has returned to its starting point, changing behaviour by changing feeling.

Although the statement of our aims is perhaps more explicit than before and the principles and methods more consciously informed and therefore teachable, the principles are the same however stated. The individual is supremely important for his own sake and is unique; he therefore demands our respect as a person. As our aim is to help him to live up to the best in himself and not make him over to our own pattern, his difficulties or problems call for solutions acceptable to him and in which he has a part. He can only be understood when seen as an individual against the background of his own culture and community; in helping him towards self determination he must therefore be helped to live within the limitations of society. We have learnt that though infants are born capable only of self love and aware only of their own needs, they are able to progress by means of satisfying emotional relationships to their first objects—mother, father and siblings, from dependence to independence; from the capacity solely for self love to the capacity to make independent meaningful relationships. By means of an ever widening circle of satisfying relationships they progress towards the full realization of their personalities through marriage and parenthood and so attain balance in their capacity to consider and meet the needs of others, which in its highest form can consider the needs of others beyond the consideration of self.

The difference between the old and the new in probation is perhaps this greater knowledge of human emotional needs which, if unmet at the right stage in development, affect adversely the process of maturation and limit the sphere of rational conduct, leaving crippled personalities. The Probation Officer has always been aware that unmet economic needs increase delinquency proneness in certain individuals and to this is now being added additional awareness of the effect of unmet emotional needs. This more comprehensive knowledge of cause and effect based on added awareness of the emotional motivation of human behaviour has contributed to the developing skills in dealing with delinquents.

The awareness that people have feelings about what is done to them and

how it is done and about their own ability or inability to cope with life's hazards, and that these feelings influence their judgments and expectations of others, gives to the officer a new sensitivity for the meaning of the probationer's own story. Learning the subjective meaning of his day to day life experiences shows the kind of experience which makes him frightened, angry or negative in his approach to living ; as well as the kind of experience which releases him from fear and frees him for positive action. The officer's aim is to enlarge the probationer's area of positive action which will gain him recognition and acceptance in his society, and to diminish the force of his negative feelings by helping him to discharge them with (or within reason on) the officer during interviews. By this means he is helped to meet his needs more realistically and healthy maturation is aided. To create the right conditions for helping people it is usually considered desirable to form a relationship which elicits positive feeling. The court setting is, however, likely to produce negative feelings in those who are directed to it. In probation the right conditions for help are created by the ability of the officer to accept hostility without becoming hostile. This demands sufficient understanding and sympathy to recognize the naturalness of the feelings of anger or fear which are evoked by being placed on probation or by contact with the law.

The following example shows the type of attitude and activity implied by 'starting where the probationer is' as well as illustrating the 'acceptance' of feeling and the use made of feeling in present day probation practice.

A father asked the court to help him control his adolescent daughter René. The magistrate, before removing René from home, condemned father for what appeared to amount to criminal conduct. The criticism was followed by a request to the father to co-operate with the Probation Officer and to allow René frequent access to the other members of her family. For a month after this court appearance father did as the magistrate had requested and René visited her home and was visited by her family. Although she did not visit when father was at home her visits were used by him to make her aware of his anger. The consequence of this, for her, was to be eventual banishment—the family planned to move away and René was not to be told where they were going. During the second month the visiting was stopped by father and all attempts by the Probation Officer to keep alive the relationship between mother and daughter were blocked by him. Father's hostility towards the officer (who had carried out the inquiry into the home circumstances, etc. for the court) became so overt that home visiting became impossible.

Cut off now from her family René became dangerously ill and, despite medical advice that she needed to re-establish relations with her family, father's attitude remained firmly against this and the impasse was considered to hold tragic possibilities for René.

At this stage another officer requested an appointment with father and two interviews followed. The following represents part of the recording of the first interview :

‘ . . . Shown into a cold, cheerless “ best room.” Father switched on the light and took a long look at me. He seemed alert and very tense, ready for battle, so I opened the interview by saying I supposed he was wondering who I was and why I had come ; he nodded, and I told him that I was a Probation Officer, that I had heard about his recent troubles and I was sure he must be very worried and unhappy. Perhaps also he was a bit confused by all that had happened, and I was wondering if I could be of any help to him. He flushed and began an angry tirade against the dishonesty of Probation Officers. Telling me he was considering proceedings for slander, he pointed to a pad of note-paper and a pencil and warned me he would make notes of our conversation for his legal advisers.

‘ I accepted this as natural in the circumstances, also telling him I had not come to criticize or to order him about, as perhaps he suspected, but only to see if there was anything we could do to make things easier and happier for him and his family, as I suspected they were all unhappy about recent events. In a quieter voice he told me about his hurt feelings at the way things had been taken out of his hands ; he had felt “ cut off.” He said that not only had his opinions not been asked, but he had been criticized and “ put in the wrong ” from the start. He showed fear at what else might be done to break up his family and protested that such action was contrary to what the public expected of court officials.

‘ I recognized his feelings of fear and anger, saying also that he must have been hurt by all that had happened and that I thought anyone would feel like this, if they saw things the way he did. I could see he must have felt confused and perhaps cut off, when no one seemed interested in him, or his point of view—that was why I had come, and I was hoping I might be allowed to help him find his way through all these difficulties. He flushed and looked very near to tears. When he spoke again, he told me in great detail how the opinions the magistrate had expressed about him were wrong—but that he could understand how people could be mistaken due to his nervous manner. He could not, however, justify the way he had been ignored and asked for my opinion about this. I could see he must have felt helpless and perhaps a bit hopeless as though everyone was working against him. With tears now swimming in his eyes he told me he was a reasonable man and could talk sensibly if given the right opportunity but he got angry when people accused him and did not give him a chance. He felt there was no point in talking to such people, that was why he had not tried to defend himself even in court. If people came with minds set against him he felt only anger and could not talk. I thought this a natural reaction but said it was a pity he had felt like that about the court, as it was only trying to discover what was best to do and this was not easy if it was denied his help. He replied that he had immediately felt that the magistrate was against him ; the magistrate had said he was not fit to be called a father. He then began to tell me how he tried to meet his everyday responsibilities as a father. Without suggesting he was a paragon he painted a picture of a fairly average father within his culture group. He gave a history of his family and described the kind of relationships he had with each of his children and then showed more fear for the future of his family. He told me of his secret plans to

take them away to another part of the country and his determination to keep his new address from René. She was a "wicked girl and the wicked must be punished", he wanted no further dealings with her. I thought this decision must have been hard for him to make and said it would be as difficult for him as for René to be "cut off" and I wondered if he thought this way would help either of them and if it was what he really wanted. He agreed it was no real solution to either his or René's situation and thought that René would "go off her head", if she was not given the right kind of help. I said we were as interested as he was to see that she got the best help so that what he feared did not happen. I knew he was angry now and that he might have good reason to be, but beneath his anger I thought he was worried for his daughter and wanted to help if he could. Weeping openly he said deep in his heart, beneath his hurt and anger at what she had done, he still loved the child . . .'

After two interviews on these lines, father was co-operating actively with the hospital. His planning for René included the re-establishment of normal family relationships for her. His final comment to the officer at the end of the second interview showed his gratitude for the help—'You have given me back my self respect.'

Although the traditional field of probation work help looks the same from the outside, it is in fact wider than just helping people to make the fullest use of the social services. As services are rendered they are rendered with thoughtful reference to the probationer's feelings so that he does not feel organized or humiliated and therefore dependent and possibly hostile. Probation casework is now aimed at helping probationers to make maximum use of themselves by helping them to sort out confused feelings and so to remove the initial barriers between themselves and the realistic solution of their difficulties. This is the old principle of self help restated with emphasis first on enabling the 'self' to be of help. The help is given primarily through the skilled use of interviewing, but it would be wrong to give the impression that modern probation practice consists of some esoteric interview technique carried on behind closed doors. Nevertheless, the importance of the interview as a dynamic process is receiving greater recognition and therefore greater attention during training both in service and at student level.

There is now much talk of 'feelings'; 'needs' are not just economic but emotional and are expressed in terms of satisfying or unsatisfying relationships. The skilled and conscious use of an emotionally satisfying relationship with the Probation Officer becomes the medium through which the probationer is helped to find himself and can begin to plan his future and act responsibly.

People who find themselves on probation are often more conscious of being a problem (to society) than of having a problem with which they need help. They often have very strong feelings of resistance either concealed or openly expressed to the 'befriending, advising and assisting' officer. What-

ever the strength of the urge of the officer to help, no permanent help is possible unless the probationer can accept it and use it profitably. The officer setting up in the business of solving other people's problems discovers that the first problem he has to solve is that he is not wanted by many of his probationers. These feelings of resistance may be related to the immediate past and perhaps the more distant past. However, we deal with the surface feeling of fear, anger and confusion arising out of arrest, court trial and the whole terrifying machinery of legal authority in operation—of which the officer is a part.

A student making a home visit for the purpose of preparing a court report on a boy aged 11, convicted of stealing a cycle, recorded the following :

'... Mrs. X received me rather coolly. While I explained who I was and why I had come, her face remained wooden and expressionless. As she made no response I said something about this being a very upsetting experience for her, to which she replied that it was and asked me what I wanted to know about Stanley.

'The following discussion on Stanley was rather useless as she replied to every point I raised with, "He's just ordinary" and kept saying, "Well, I don't know what else I can tell you", despite the fact that she had told me practically nothing.

'I then said it must be very difficult for her to have to talk to a stranger about her son and I could understand if she felt my visit as an intrusion into her home, perhaps she thought I was some kind of policeman in plain clothes. At this she smiled and said sarcastically, "Oh, no, they come in threes", and went on to tell me how three policemen had called and treated her as though she were a criminal. They had, she said, bullied her and cross-questioned her without giving her a proper chance to speak. She told me, with considerable feeling, it was disgraceful to treat decent people in such a way. She was obviously furious at the way "they turned the house inside out, looking for stolen property", and she had only just managed to refrain from "throwing things at them".

'I recognized the difficulties of such an experience and said if she expected me to behave like that I could see why I was not welcome.

'Smiling rather sheepishly, Mrs. X said it was good to know I was not going to be like that, and I said many people were often wary at first, but we had a different function in the court from the police. I then explained again what this was. This time she listened attentively and then asked if I would share a pot of tea with her, saying, "We've both earned it".

'Over tea she talked so freely that I had no difficulty in getting the information for the Court Report...'

The probationer's recent experience with the law will have conditioned his expectation of the Probation Officer's intentions towards him and the officer needs first to recognize this with him and then show him that authority is not only power to punish but power to help; that in a place where he has been judged he can now be accepted uncritically and without judgment; that his feelings are not only recognized but

accepted as natural for him at present. In this non-threatening atmosphere, the resistance, distress and tension can diminish. As there is no longer the need to defend, the relationship begins to differ from his expectations of it and the helping function is felt by him. As he is freed from his resistance and experiences the feeling of being helped, he can then perhaps 'move in' or move on to seek for the help of which he may stand in need. As he does this he will talk and the officer will then begin to learn, not by probing and cross-questioning, but simply by interpreting the variety of feelings expressed and by helping to clarify these where they are confused. Some questions there may be—but these are related directly to the probationer's concern and it is accepted that the officer has no right to know anything more about the probationer than he needs to know in order to help.

Students are now carefully taught the stages in studying the total situation, (*i.e.* the person's environment both external and internal), assessing the strength of the stress situation for him and gaining a clear appreciation of his problem, and at the same time appraising both his desire and his capacity to resolve his difficulties so that the work may be geared to meet his total needs. Within the Service itself all officers are encouraged to spend some time on study diagnosis and planning activity but, of course, such thinking is continuous from the first contact with the probationer to the termination of the official relationship. This thinking calls for a considerable measure of objectivity apart from the demands it makes on knowledge. Perhaps the Probation Officer's activity can best be described as thinking dispassionately and acting compassionately. With so much emphasis on feeling it was a natural development to help the Probation Officer deal satisfactorily with his own feelings by learning about them and learning to understand and use them.

The officer has feelings about his own authority and working for a court, about various kinds of offences and hence offenders. All these are important influences on the way he handles people sent to him for advice, assistance and friendship. How he conducts the relationship and how this influences the probationer has become tremendously important in training him in the practice of using himself and his knowledge constructively, and so providing the maximum opportunity for the probationer to succeed in the task ahead of him. As it is important that the 'worker must offer his personality as a contribution to the new total situation in which the client and he are facing life, in such a way that the client can feel that the worker's personality is alongside his own' (1) it is important to teach him how to do this.

This is the most important of the recent developments. It is not really new to talk about study, diagnosis and treatment. It is perhaps not new to talk of assessing motivation and capacity for change or development, but

to add to this the third element, study of the *opportunity* afforded to the probationer for change and development, is new. This study demands careful assessment and evaluation of the officer's activity in relation to the probationer's total needs. Evaluation implies knowledge of what is right and good and is more than the application of the officer's own subjective values. Training offered to probation students taking part in the Applied Social Studies course is a blend of both theory and practice carried out under carefully supervised conditions. The basic aim of this kind of professional education is 'to teach the student to think objectively in a situation which involves him emotionally' (2). The qualifications for entrance into the Service remain similar. Present day selection procedures attempt to isolate people with strong motivations to help who show evidence of capacity to re-examine their own attitudes and change those which may block understanding, *i.e.* 'an ability for growth, expressing itself in educability' (3). Although the qualifications for entrance into the Probation Service remain similar, selection and training for University qualifications in professional casework are less easily separated. University professional casework training now includes methods of testing the strength and nature of the motivation and controlling it.

We know that 'the motivation for helping others is not always commendable. When we want to help the less fortunate . . . we may do so out of real love of God and our fellow-men, or because we feel guilty about our own selfish desires, or to compensate for meanness or ruthlessness in ourselves. . . . The truth is that there are mixed motivations in the best of us, so that one of the essentials in treating others' (*especially delinquents*) 'is understanding and facing ourselves. The social worker, of course, is not free from unlovely motives, but he will not prove really helpful to others unless he has learned to recognize the bad as well as the good impulses in himself—learned to accept them as fact—and in spite of them developed his capacity to 'love' many different kinds of person, or at least to refrain from injuring them, by being aware of the less admirable feelings which persist within. If the social worker has warmth and a sincere desire to help, he can in his training learn to control his impulses wisely, but if he lacks concern for others he can never be trained for effective service' (4).

In order to offer the best opportunities to the probationer the officer in training accepts the help of a supervisor whose responsibility it is to teach knowledge where necessary. This may range from minor information on how to see a prisoner in gaol, through the detail of the necessary probation rules, to understanding of either simple or complex personality dynamics. What is taught is dependent upon what the officer needs in order to help

him perform his task more easily, competently and consciously. It is through the medium of a supervisor that the young officer is helped towards self-awareness and so learns the meaning of, as well as the need for, controlled use of himself and his knowledge. This is what is new in probation work. The aim is both to 'teach the student what he needs to know about the operation of the social services and also to help him towards a growing understanding of the variety of human motivation and experience and to a clearer and more disciplined understanding of his own personality in relation to its impact upon this mass of hopes and fears, struggles and failures, desires and frustrations' (3). The officer is helped to achieve skilled and conscious use of himself and his knowledge in order that he may be able to offer the probationer the maximum opportunity for change.

The probation relationship is guided by objective consideration of the total needs of the probationer and is fashioned by a skilled and compassionate attempt to meet these needs; thus adding the 'what' and the 'how' to the 'why'. The immediate emotional needs of the officer, either conscious or unconscious, seek no satisfaction in such a relationship. The relationship therefore is not a personal friendship but a professional relationship in the sense that it is carefully focused on the probationer. 'Love is part of the dynamics . . . but it must be a special sort of love—a disciplined concern, not indulgence for oneself' (4).

So far only a small number of officers within the Probation Service have developed skills under supervision and the majority of these have been trained by other disciplines, although mainly at the expense of the Probation Training Funds. Since 1954, however, as part of the Applied Social Studies Course of the London School of Economics, the Probation Service is helping to train its own recruits in this way. The greatest obstacle to the recent developments becoming general is the present shortage of trained supervisors. In the meantime, the needs of inservice training are being met in various ways; by selected groups of officers working with a psychiatrist to increase their own awareness of the part played by feeling (their own and the probationer's) in determining the outcome of the work they do; and by specially arranged psychiatric consultation. Under the Home Office training schemes and also those organized by the National Association of Probation Officers, the method and practice of casework is being taught by a few casework supervisors at present working through group discussion or through individual consultation with officers. In organized courses of a week or more, often only a week-end, some of the know why and the know how is demonstrated by casework teachers.

Finally, although the application of these new methods of thinking is so

far limited, there are enough indications to suggest that they will determine the pattern of future development in the Probation Service.

REFERENCES

- (1) WILSON, ROGER, 'Aims and Methods of a Department of Social Studies', *Social Work*, October 1949.
- (2) TOWLE, CHARLOTTE, 'The Learner in Education for the Professions', University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- (3) YOUNGHUSBAND, EILEEN, 'Social Work in Britain', Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, 1951.
- (4) HAMILTON, GORDON, 'Social Work as Human Relations', *Anniversary Papers of the New York School of Social Work*, 1949.

NOTES AND CRITICISMS

SCIENTIFIC GROUP FOR THE DISCUSSION OF DELINQUENCY PROBLEMS

This Group, founded on 15th January, 1953, under the auspices of the I.S.T.D., nurtured in its early stages by the latter and enjoying still its close support and co-operation, has now established itself as an independent specialist discussion group. Its combined approach by varied professional disciplines and experienced lay field workers to a specific social problem forms a pattern of group activity which is in many ways unique in this country.

The object of the Group is 'to hold meetings at which scientific papers shall be given and discussion initiated with a view to promoting understanding between the various approaches and disciplines concerned with the scientific study of delinquency'. Membership is composed of 'persons of recognized professional status in their own branch of science or delinquency work, in the former instance having also a theoretical or practical interest in delinquency work'. Present membership numbers about 120.

The affairs of the Group are managed by an organizing committee composed of practising members of each of the following disciplines or occupations: Biology, Criminal Law and Justice, Criminology, Education, Ethics and Moral Philosophy, Organic Medicine, Psychiatry, Psychoanalysis, Psychology, Statistics, Social work, Sociology, and Treatment of Offenders.

Dr. Edward Glover was elected as the Group's first chairman in 1953. He was succeeded in 1956 by the present chairman, Dr. Hermann Mannheim. The Chairman-Elect is Dr. Denis Carroll.

Four or five discussion meetings are held each year, these having been confined so far to evening meetings in London. Two of the most successful of these have been symposia, in which three speakers have approached their subject ('Prediction' and 'Delinquency Areas') from widely differing points of view or from varying backgrounds of field experience.

Some idea of the range of topics covered can be gained from the following 'random' selection made from the past three years: the sociological approach, a psychoanalytic commentary on team methods of research, physiological aspects, the application of penological science, the therapeutic community approach, the American parole system, military delinquency, psychopathic offenders, open prison treatment, and so on.

Speakers have varied in nationality and in their specialist approach and experience. These have included criminology, forensic psychiatry, genetics, jurisprudence, penology, philosophy, psychology, psychoanalysis, public administration, sociology and statistics. The speakers have all been figures of major status in their respective fields and it would be invidious to single out individual names.

The programme now being planned for 1956-57 seeks to cover the following topics: juvenile prostitution, the case-work approach to probation, allocation and classification, a philosophical subject and some account of recent developments probably in America and Scandinavia.

Vacancies still exist in the Group for new members with appropriate qualifications or experience in delinquency work, whatever their particular approach. Applications would be welcomed, especially from people working in educational, institutional, court and legal settings. These fields are somewhat under-represented in the membership, and a proper balance of disciplines is regarded as essential for the full development of the Group's basic aims of cross-fertilization of ideas and a furthering of the inter-disciplinary understanding of delinquency problems.

PROGRAMME OF SPEAKERS, 1953-56

- 15th January, 1953. Professor Van Bemmelen, Professor of Criminal Law, etc., and Director of the Criminological Institute, University of Leiden, Holland—Criminal Typologies, a comparative survey.
- 12th March, 1953. Mrs. Barbara Wootton, M.A., J.P., Nuffield Research Fellow at Bedford College—A Sociological Approach to the Study of Delinquency.
- 10th June, 1953. Dr. Edward Glover, M.D., Chairman of the Scientific Committee of the I.S.T.D.—Team Methods of Research on Delinquency; a psychoanalytic commentary.
- 11th November, 1953. Drs. W. Grey Walter and R. Sessions Hodge, Physiologist and Research Psychiatrist respectively to the Burden Neurological Institute, Bristol—Physiological Aspects of Delinquency.
- 29th January, 1954. Dr. Hermann Mannheim, Reader in Criminology in the University of London—American Impressions of a Criminologist.
- 25th March, 1954. Sir Lionel Fox, C.B., M.C., Chairman of the Prison Commission—The Application of Penological Science.
- 27th May, 1954. Dr. Maxwell Jones, Director of the Social Rehabilitation Unit, Belmont Hospital—A Community Approach to the Problem of Anti-Social Character Disorders.
- 12th October, 1954. Dr. Norman S. Hayner, Professor of Sociology, University of Washington—The American Parole System with special reference to the State of Washington.
- 16th December, 1954. Dr. J. C. Penton, Chief Psychologist to the War Office—Recent Research on Military Delinquency.

- 22nd February, 1955. Professor L. S. Penrose, M.A., M.D., the Galton Laboratory, University College, London—Genetics and the Criminal.
- 26th April, 1955. Mr. L. T. Wilkins, Senior Research Officer, the Social Survey ; Mr. C. P. Hill, Children's Department, the Home Office, and Dr. T. C. N. Gibbens, Senior Lecturer in Forensic Psychiatry, the Maudsley Hospital—Symposium on Predictive Methods in the Treatment of Delinquency.
- 19th September, 1955. Professor Thorsten Sellin, Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania—A Commentary on the Third International Congress on Criminology on the subject of Recidivism.
- 17th November, 1955. Professor H. C. L. Hart, Professor of Jurisprudence in the University of Oxford—The Theory of Punishment.
- 19th January, 1956. Mr. J. B. Mays, Tutor in Social Science, University of Liverpool ; Dr. T. P. M. Morris, Assistant Lecturer in Social Administration, London School of Economics, and Dr. J. C. Spencer, Director of the Bristol Social Research Project—Symposium on Delinquency Areas.
- 15th March, 1956. Dr. Denis Carroll, Consultant Psychiatrist, the Portman Clinic—The Ambulant Treatment of Psychopathic Offenders.
- 10th May, 1956. Mr. R. D. Fairn, Director of Prison Administration—The Treatment of Offenders by Open Prison Methods.

R. L. MORRISON,
Hon. Secretary.

DELINQUENCY AREAS *

I

When we were aroused from our dogmatic and slumbrous attitudes of disapproval about delinquency, many of us, myself included, were deeply impressed by the interpretation of delinquent behaviour given by the psycho-analysts. Many of us, myself included, remain impressed, and yet I feel that the pathological explanation of delinquency does not fit a very large number of delinquents.

While I have been in Nottingham I have had the good fortune to find friends among that section of the community from which delinquents frequently come, and most of them have talked quite openly about the petty crimes they have committed, or have refrained from committing on the grounds that the risk was too great for the meagre rewards they might achieve. We all know that the most serene and 'normal' exterior may be but a façade behind which swirl whirlpools of unmentionable desire, but I really could not believe that my young friends were what is called 'seriously disturbed'. They took their petty thefts and dishonesties in their stride, much as I take the risk of parking my car for three-quarters of an hour in a place where I am only allowed twenty minutes. I calculate on the day, I scan the street for coppers, I use the unfrequented end. Why do I not choose the busy end? It isn't worth it. So I hear from Bill, who has just got a job delivering coal, that his employer, when setting him on, warned him not to

* Papers read in a Symposium on Delinquency Areas at a meeting of the Scientific Group for the Discussion of Delinquency Problems, on January 19th, 1956.

fiddle in much the same terms. 'Don't be a bloody fool' he said, 'just for a couple of bob—it isn't worth it!', adding significantly enough: 'If it were a couple of hundred pounds...'

My friends, in fact, lived in a different moral climate. They considered illegalities as possible courses of action, and accepted or rejected them in terms of the risk involved. After reading Sutherland's 'White Collar Crime', I realized that, in my world too, we did exactly the same, only the illegalities were different. It looks as though every section of the community—every 'sub-culture'—has its fringe of illegal hazards, which carry with them no moral condemnation within the group itself.

In this whole matter, I think the more or less recent emphasis on social psychology has been illuminating. Doubtless there is not much that is new, but we are forcibly reminded that our moral judgments spring largely from the judgments we hear pronounced by the people with whom we consort. Of course there is room for individual reflexion and invention; of course the 'official moral standards' pervade every social sector, but for the most part our ambitions, our aspirations, our respect or disrespect for certain parts of the legal code are determined by the standards of the groups to which we belong.

The question is: are there really different groups with different standards, or is it all a matter of individuals who are, as it were, socially half-baked—as I think the psycho-analysts would say. I was fortunate enough to be able, in a small way, to satisfy myself that sub-cultures do exist side by side within the compass of the same income groups. In a town in Nottinghamshire, for example, we found two streets next door to one another, the one respectable, the other not. In the respectable street the parents took great pains over the upbringing of their children, they taught them 'the value of money' and did not give them any just for the asking, they took a grave view about stealing, they were rather prudish, they watched over their children's leisure time, and they had high hopes for their future. In the other street life was easier. Children were allowed to do much as they pleased, they were bribed not to make nuisances of themselves, money was fairly easily come by, they thought but little of pinching what they could, and their sexual sophistication was remarkable. I should hazard a guess that if any delinquents from these two streets were to be judged 'seriously disturbed' they would come from the respectable group. Such contrasts are by no means new; the 'respectable' and the 'roughs' are always cropping up as hostile parties on housing estates. What I believe to be important is the influence which the ethos of a whole street has on the individual child brought up in it. It is a Durkheimian social fact, external and compelling.

Studies in the ecology of crime can be divided into two kinds: bricks and mortar ecology and social psychological ecology. To plot the incidence of crime—either its locus or the addresses of the perpetrators—against low housing values, slum areas, overcrowding, the presence of warehouses and shops etc., is fairly easy, but, in my view, it is not particularly useful. To investigate the 'climate of opinion' in the streets and squares from which delinquents come is much more difficult, but incomparably more worth while. This is what the symposiasts have been, and are, doing. I hope their contributions will tempt others to follow their example.

W. J. H. SPROTT.

II

Ecological studies have shown beyond any doubt that certain well-defined areas close to the commercial hub of big cities in the United States are conspicuous for their high concentration of social problems of which crime and delinquency form one significant aspect. Comparable studies carried out recently by my colleagues in Liverpool have revealed a similar pattern of distribution for social defects which include the incidence of mental illness, infant mortality and juvenile delinquency.¹ As a result of my own researches in the southern dockside area of Liverpool² I found it useful to employ the concept of a specialized juvenile culture pattern in conflict with the culture of the community as a whole. That is to say, there was a well-defined social tradition for children to commit certain forms of illegal acts such as shop-lifting, 'lorry-skipping' and petty larceny. Delinquency is thus embodied in a way of life, is part and parcel of the juvenile code and pattern of behaviour to which the majority tend to conform. Moreover, since the adult members of the neighbourhood were more tolerant of delinquency than the adults of other areas and in some cases openly encouraged children to commit offences, it seemed reasonable to categorize the whole area as a 'delinquent subculture'. Although delinquency tended to die out in late adolescence and crime was much less widespread amongst adults than amongst juveniles, there appeared to be clear indications that certain aspects of child-care in the home and other conditioning features of the locality produced together a social environment markedly conducive to delinquent behaviour amongst the children.

The social structure of the dockside area has a number of distinguishing features which make it become the forcing ground of a particular type of delinquent subculture as compared with other districts of the city. There is first of all a long history of economic disadvantage, inferior educational opportunity, overcrowding, poverty, inter-racial hostility, lack of public amenities, casual and unskilled employment and, until recent years, unemployment of a chronic character. Such economic factors tend to produce an attitude of mind which is partly fatalistic and depressed and partly devil-may-care and aggressive. Money is not so much sought as an end in itself or for the security it brings, as in a typical middle class culture, but as a means of gaining popularity and status within the gang or the friendship group. Money and goods are prestige symbols and offences are committed to acquire them. Not that the goods and stolen articles are lacking in intrinsic value themselves. Money is also a quick way for a delinquent to obtain the various pleasures his immature personality so passionately and immediately desires to enjoy. Hence most offences are committed against property and, as far as children are concerned, usually entail shop-lifting.

Overcrowding and large families, inadequate facilities within the home, drive children to seek their recreation outside the family unit and on the streets. Plentiful leisure, few amenities, lack of ambition and incentives to further education in the familial and social environment lead to a tradition of ganging. Such gangs may be

¹ I am indebted to Mrs. R. M. Castle, Miss Elizabeth Gittus and Mrs. E. Townend for this as yet unpublished information.

² 'Growing Up in the City', Liverpool University Press, 1954.

either delinquent or non-delinquent : most juvenile gangs in the dockside areas of Liverpool are composite in character, sometimes breaking the law together and at other times pursuing perfectly respectable activities. Boys who have grown up in such conditions tend to perpetuate them. There is little room at home for children to play, therefore they go out on to the streets. Children tend to seek playmates outside the home, therefore fathers do not consider it their responsibility to supervise their offsprings' leisure time. In this way early training and experience condition the way people treat their own children when the time comes for them to be parents themselves.

Juvenile gangs do not arise entirely from economic causes or purely as a direct outcome of the social structure of the neighbourhood. There are also psychological and emotional factors in the mind of the individual delinquent himself. 'Togetherness' is an important factor, the desire to associate with other children and to win the respect and affection of contemporaries which is so necessary for mental health at a certain stage of psychological development when the child is preparing to leave the security of the family circle to mix with the wider world outside. It is a fear of the painful isolation of loneliness rather than a desire to achieve social status that determines this group-centred reaction at this particular stage of development. This may involve taking risks in the only way that is open to the boys of that locality, *i.e.* breaking into warehouses along the dock road as a proof of strength, courage and skill and a means of obtaining emotional sodality. A proportion of overtly delinquent activity within the juvenile tradition then turns out to be a substitute method of outlet for energies, drives and emotions denied by the physical background and the social structure of underprivileged neighbourhoods and further facilitated by accepted canons of child-care and parental training inherited as an acquired pattern from one generation to another. Thus many contributory strands (social, economic and psychological) combine to produce a delinquent community. Each is important but it is the psychological factors which give the delinquent subculture its reproductive power and allow a particular pattern of behaviour to perpetuate itself over the years. The delinquency, I would argue, is largely incidental, and may be regarded as a means to ends which in other *milieux* are gained in other and probably more acceptable ways.

This sociological analysis of the delinquent subculture is extremely valuable when we come to consider what seems to me to be a most important distinction between categories of offenders. The two main types may be distinguished in a variety of ways and under various names. The line must be drawn between the seriously disturbed, chronic offender and the short-term offender who is not a psychiatric case and is merely conforming to the norms of his social group. The latter constitute the majority of delinquents, both those officially dealt with and those whose offences pass undetected, in the urban subculture with which I am familiar. The crimes typical of such a subculture are altogether less vicious and less violent than those of the sort of subculture that exists in the United States. The majority of youngsters here succumb to temptations temporarily and are more often than not led astray. The environmental delinquent is a nuisance but not a menace. Unless there is emotional deprivation in addition to the existence of delinquent infections in the social background this anti-social phase will very likely pass away when adolescence begins. For the psychologically disturbed child illegal conduct may be regarded as a series of distress signals to which the family and

the community ought to direct their attention. If these distress signals are ignored or if the child is mishandled, he may enter into a phase of more determined anti-social behaviour in a desperate attempt to cope with his internal problems and as a form of revenge on his parents, the community, or even fate.

These two categories of offenders are further distinguished by their differing standards of behaviour and the ethical values implicit in their attitudes to other people. While the chronic offender is reacting against the failure of society or of his family to provide him with necessary satisfactions, the short-term environmentally conditioned delinquent is merely following an unsatisfactory type of leadership. He is indeed more immature than wicked. The short-term delinquent as revealed by my research in Liverpool possessed an ethical code; not quite the code of the middle-class public schoolboy, but a very definite scale of values personal to himself and common to his group of friends. Boys made distinctions between the sorts of people they could and those they could not steal from. Equally there were some distinctions made regarding whom one could steal for; one would not, according to one delinquent, steal a present to give to one's mother, but one could steal presents for sisters. Again distinctions were frequently made between individuals and organizations, between, for example, a man personally responsible for goods carried in his lorry and a shop-assistant who would not have to make good any deficiencies; between a small one-man shop and a large chain stores, between more helpless elderly people and those better able to look after themselves. It is the mere fact that the boys draw such distinctions that is of such vital importance and makes their eventual adjustments to the norms of the wider community more likely. They have not cut themselves off from the rest of society; they acknowledge personal relationships and personal responsibilities, though as yet at a level below that expected by law. On the other hand that much rarer bird, the confirmed young criminal, exhibits typically psychopathic traits. He accepts little personal responsibility, acknowledges the slenderest of relationships and allows his hostility to override any feeling of obligation to other people. Since there is nobody whose opinion he values, no one he wishes to shield from pain or discomfort, he has hardly any soft or vulnerable spots in his make-up.

Even within the delinquent subculture there are strong forces making for generally acceptable standards of behaviour. A great many people are uneasy about the high frequency of bad behaviour and delinquency. Parents will express this concern by blaming the neighbourhood and the noxious influence of other people's children. The concept of 'respectability' is very significant and some folk will go to great lengths to establish their respectability. Others will react with almost hysterical vehemence to any imputations against them. There is, therefore, this state of constant tension within the delinquent subculture itself; awareness of the facts and of the very real dangers produces anxiety, guilt feelings, a sense of social inferiority, fear and inter-group condemnation. The community is, therefore, not a homogeneous unit and there are many marginal families, households, that is to say, where one or more of the members has fallen foul of the law while the remainder are uneasily concerned on their account. Between the few families who have accepted a position of open hostility to the rest of society and the few who have no stain on the records of any of their members bulks this large middle group of 'marginals' who have not outlawed themselves but yet are partly tainted by the delinquent environment. These are the families from whom

the majority of short-term juvenile offenders spring and these are the families who both need and deserve help and encouragement. Community projects designed to reduce delinquency statistics should in the main be framed with such households in mind as they are the ones most likely to respond to social treatment and to repay the expenditure of money and effort on their behalf.

JOHN BARRON MAYS.

III

The research ³ about which I would like briefly to talk was essentially an attempt to test out certain hypotheses about delinquency in a county borough (pop. 250,000) which is considerably more than a dormitory suburb of London, being an important centre of industry and commerce, yet which does not have the distinctive characteristics of a great city like Birmingham or Liverpool.

The research scheme attempted to examine, among others, the following broad hypotheses. 1. Were the important delinquency areas adjacent to the central business district and/or in areas characterized by physical deterioration, social disorganization and dominated by commercial and industrial property? 2. Were the areas of high juvenile delinquency rates also characterized by high rates of adult crime? 3. Was there a demonstrable relationship between delinquency and family organization observable at a local level?

Three series of data were obtained relating to the year 1952 as follows: Series I. A list of all indictable offences, and certain non-indictable offences, such as indecent exposure, loitering with intent, etc. committed in the borough. Series II. The addresses of all local residents charged with offences. Series III. The detailed case histories of the 64 boys and 15 girls placed on probation or committed to an Approved School in 1952.

The 2,149 offences comprising Series I were analysed by type and the pattern of distribution was:

	Per cent.
Offences against the person (excluding sex offences)	0.70
Sex offences (including homosexual offences)	5.00
Larcenies without violence (excluding receiving)	67.72
Breakings, attempted breakings, burglary and unlawful entry ...	18.20
Receiving, unlawful possession, frauds and miscellaneous offences	8.38

Simple and minor larcenies comprised the bulk of the total of thefts, the next most common being larcenies from unattended motor vehicles, followed by larceny of pedal cycles. The most frequent sex offence was indecent exposure, followed by homosexual offences, direct assaults on females accounting for less than 1/8th of all sex offences.

The spatial distribution of offences indicated that 25 per cent. of all crimes occurred in the central business district within a radius of a quarter of a mile from the Town Hall, and about a further 25 per cent. in or about the three main subsidiary shopping centres. The rest were scattered over a wide area of the borough, with minor concentrations near building sites, the industrial trading estate, and recreation grounds.

³ See *Brit. J. Delinq.*, Vol. IV, No. 4, Current Research XXXVII.

Series II produced a somewhat different pattern of concentration. The largest number of cases were situated on two of the inter-war council housing estates, while there were much smaller concentrations in two of the older residential areas which are characterized by poor housing and physical deterioration. Perhaps more interesting, however, is the fact that the areas in which the largest number of crimes were committed produced relatively few offenders, although those which produced the most offenders were the scene of rather more crimes than those areas which produced very few offenders.

For the incidence of crime and the numbers of offenders to be meaningful, some more precise measure had to be made. For Series I, therefore, a set of *offence rates* was calculated on the basis of crimes per acre and crimes per 1,000 of population. The wards comprising the central business district produced rates of 1.31 and 46.05 respectively. The wards with the highest rates of offenders, on the other hand, had offence rates in the order of 0.46 and 8.84, 0.42 and 9.77, and 0.20 and 8.87.

Rates of offenders were calculated on the basis of the numbers of persons charged as a percentage of the total at risk. Accordingly, the 1 per cent. sample figures of the 1951 Census were obtained from the Registrar General's Department and, in order to minimize the sampling error, the sexes were combined, and rates calculated for three main age groups: (i) under 17s, (ii) 17-39 and (iii) 40 and over. The borough rates for each of these age groups were 0.39, 0.48 and 0.14 respectively, and for all ages 0.30. The ward variation in these rates was, however, considerable; the juvenile rate, for example, ranged from 1.57 to 0.06, the 17-39 rate from 1.24 to 0.08 and that for all ages from 0.75 to 0.09. The over-40 rate was rather more constant, only ranging from 0.32 to 0.06. The ward rates were then tabulated on the basis of being above or below the borough rate, and it was found that in every ward each of the four rates were either consistently above or consistently below the borough rate. This fact appeared to confirm our second hypothesis, namely, that areas with high rates of juvenile offenders are also characterized by high rates of adult offenders.

Our initial hypothesis about the location of delinquency areas, in the light of the evidence provided by the data in Series I and II, required, however, some modification. It needed, in fact, to be superseded by a new hypothesis, namely, that there are areas in which factors operate to *predispose* the individual towards committing delinquent acts, while there are others containing factors which may induce or *precipitate* a specific offence. Absence of effective agencies of social control in the neighbourhood, 'social contagion', and a local criminal tradition, combined with bad housing, unsatisfactory family relationships and a lack of adequate facilities for constructive leisure and lawful amusement, are all social facts which may separately or collectively predispose the individual towards crime and delinquency. But the situation is characterized by *potentiality* rather than actuality.

The areas of the borough with the highest rates of offences did provide many of these opportunities, while those where offenders lived provided them far less frequently. But to examine the matrix of predisposing factors in the areas of delinquent residence, a series of correlation coefficients was calculated between the rates of offenders and three other social indices, population density, overcrowding, and the proportion of middle-class households. Overcrowding was

defined on a ward basis as the proportion of households living at a density of more than 2 persons/room, the borough average being 0.69 persons/room. The proportion of middle-class households was defined in terms of the percentage of Jurors on the Register of Electors. The coefficients produced were as follows: with overcrowding, +0.74; with population density, +0.44; with middle-class households, -0.76.

Turning now to problems of the relationship between delinquency and family organization at a local level, analysis of Series III, the case histories of probation and approved school cases, showed association between delinquents in any locality to be considerable, and in the inter-war housing estates to be virtually a norm of expectation. But perhaps more interesting was the distribution of these children in terms of the occupation of the household head. In the borough as a whole, the social class distribution is as follows: Class I, 52/per th.; Class II, 196/th.; Class III, 568/th.; Class IV, 86/th.; Class V, 98/th. The percentage distribution of the delinquents in Series III, however, was: Class I, nil; Class II, nil; Class III, 25.25 per cent.; Class IV, 17.41 per cent.; Class V, 57.34 per cent. The cases were further analysed in terms of 22 other variables covering a wide range of social, psychological and economic factors. It was significant that the children of the unskilled manual workers in Class V had more experience of parental disharmony, rejection and separation, had more unfortunate emotional experiences in early childhood, and were more emotionally disturbed. They came, too, from families with a greater incidence of mental disorder or epilepsy and were subjected to lax or inconsistent discipline more frequently than the children in Classes IV and III.

It might be argued that this evidence demonstrates the relative unimportance of local factors in precipitating delinquency and points to the value of the predominantly psychological approach to the problem. My own view is that, on the contrary, it demonstrates the need for a reasonable synthesis of the hypotheses of the two disciplines, psychology and sociology, in understanding delinquent behaviour. The situation in this borough is that, on the housing estates, 'difficult' or 'defective' families are highly localized as a result of a conscious housing policy, with the result that certain street play groups contain an unduly high proportion of children in a variety of unsatisfactory socio-psychological circumstances. The chances of any one of them committing an offence are undoubtedly related to the number and strength of the delinquent influences operating in his immediate local environment.

The importance of the different social class patterns of child-rearing seems particularly great. Absence of effective parental control over leisure activities is not an index of the abdication of parental responsibility, but simply due to the fact that while the middle-class child plays indoors or in his own garden under the parental eye, the working-class child plays naturally in the street with his pals. Even the undesirable psychological factors which may occur rather more frequently in the life experience of the child of the unskilled labourer are not altogether without sociological implications. The class pattern of socialization is such that the child is less conditioned to 'control' than is his middle-class cousin who began with strict training in the nursery. The middle-class child is less likely to break down under stress situations because of this conditioning to control from infancy, and if and when he does break down there are more socially approved outlets for his emotions and better facilities for covering up his misdemeanours.

The lower the family's economic status and stability, the more likely are stresses to arise and the less conditioned are its members to cope with them. The local variation in delinquency rates, then, is not merely a function of differential association but also of the socialization patterns of the different social classes distributed geographically.

T. P. M. MORRIS.

IV

In this paper I propose to discuss (i) some of the observations which emerge from an action-research project in Bristol; (ii) the relationship between these observations and the general theoretical framework elaborated by Professor Sprott and the other symposiasts; (iii) certain problems on which further empirical study seems to be needed.

(i) Bristol is a city containing a population of 445,000. Already before the outbreak of World War II the removal of families from slum clearance areas in the centre of the city and their re-housing on the periphery had steadily developed. As a result of heavy war-time bombing the centre of the city was seriously damaged and the building of new housing estates grew quickly in the post-war years.

One of my first tasks was to decide on the area or areas in which the project would operate. In selecting these areas the terms of reference were not confined to delinquency alone and our main emphasis has in fact been on 'strain and stress in the family within the setting of the local community'. One of the consequences of widening the terms of reference has been to see the delinquent families in relation to the environment in which they live and also to focus attention on their non-delinquent neighbours. In this initial selection of areas I chose a number of commonly accepted indices of family breakdown and plotted the distribution of each of them on a map of Bristol. The result of this work was to show marked evidence of clustering in certain areas. The indices chosen were adult crime, juvenile delinquency, persistent truancy, child deprivation, and mental deficiency. The clustering of these indices occurred mainly in three areas, two of them housing estates on the periphery of the city and the third an old central area.

The explanation of the clustering in the two housing estates seems to be as follows: each of the two estates was first built in the years 1921-38 as part of a slum clearance programme. At that time they were populated with a high proportion of large families moved from slum areas. The closely knit kinship system which is typical of the slum subculture has developed on the estate in subsequent years and the norms of many of these families have persisted at a subcultural level in the new environment.

At this point one might argue that the norms and family structure of the 'social problem group' have remained the same in spite of changes in environment and the new social services of the Welfare State. Such a hypothesis is not easily tested in areas with a high rate of residential mobility, because of the effects of the selective process of housing policy and the self-selection of the tenants themselves. New and old areas of the city acquire a particular status in the opinion of residents as well as of the Housing Authority. Whereas in the old central areas where land and property are largely privately owned the scale of rents and of land values is geared to the economy of a competitive market, the housing estate on

the other hand is planned, built, and owned by the Local Authority. The selection and placement of tenants is the responsibility of the local Housing Department. Local Authority estates vary in design, in the level of rents and in the status of residents, and it is natural that in general families in the lower are separated from those in the higher income groups. A continual process of movement takes place in which families with status aspiration seek to improve their position by moving to an estate of higher status provided that they are able to pay the appropriate rent. Movement of this kind is in part facilitated or discouraged according to the availability of housing accommodation in relation to the pressure of prospective tenants on the authority's waiting lists.

The result of this process is a system of social selection and (more appropriately in the case of the delinquency area) of social segregation by which certain estates become stigmatized through the concentration of subcultural families in parts of the estate. As a result of an initial concentration through a slum clearance programme a self-perpetuating mechanism seems to occur resulting in the emigration of upward mobile families from delinquency areas to estates of higher status, and the immigration of new families considered by the Housing Authority to be appropriate for the area. The housing manager or his agent, the rent collector, acts as a kind of status registrar, locating the family on the estate and even in the street which he considers to be most appropriate. The extent to which this location policy is adopted depends on a variety of factors such as the availability of accommodation, the variety and design of houses, and the level of rents. The delinquency area is, as it were, the extreme case. It would be misleading, however, to exaggerate the rôle of the housing manager. Tenants' own preferences, particularly their anxiety to move their children away from the delinquency area in cases where they perceive a threat to their own standards of child-rearing, are an extremely important factor.

These observations raise the old question of the explanation of delinquency areas in terms of the 'breeding' hypothesis and the 'attraction' hypothesis. The 'attraction' hypothesis is supported by evidence in the field of mental disorder. In an ecological survey of first admissions to Bristol Mental Hospitals over a five-year period Dr. E. Hare⁴ points out that whereas the distribution of manic-depression and also of neurosis is random throughout Bristol, in the case of schizophrenia there is a marked concentration in the old central areas of the city. A high rate for males is observed in the poor central areas while in the good central areas, classified in terms of social class, the rate is high in the case of females. Hare also finds that, whereas the distribution of schizophrenics living in their family setting does not depart significantly from random, the very opposite is the case of schizophrenics living out of family setting. In this second group personality difficulties resulted in patients leaving their families and moving to where boarding-house accommodation was available, that is, to the central areas where the proportion of single-person households is high. It is of interest to compare Hare's findings with our own study. Both point in different ways to the importance of selective migration and to the force of the 'attraction' hypothesis.

(ii) Both Professor Sprott and Dr. Morris are critical of many aspects of the

⁴ E. H. Hare : 'Mental Illness and Social Conditions in Bristol', *Journal of Mental Science*, 1956, **102**, 349-57.

ecological approach to the delinquency area. Sprott points out that it is the social climate of the area rather than the ecological factors *per se* that are of importance. Morris has argued that the concept of natural areas confuses spatial or territorial uniformity with cultural uniformity. A study of the Bristol housing estate which I have described supports these views. Though the estate is characterized by uniformity of layout and design and is clearly demarcated from the middle-class owner-occupied houses on its circumference, there are within the estate marked variations in the social climate. A classification of streets in terms of certain overt signs of social status such as neighbour relationships, maintenance of house and garden, attitude to children, shows noticeable disparities not only between streets but even within streets. Sprott's own study in 'Radby' of two streets with contrasted social climates also illustrates the point that the social climate of the street and the norms of behaviour which are accepted by its members are of far greater importance than physical layout.

The study of variations in the social climate of streets on this estate certainly supports the contention that territorial uniformity is by no means synonymous with cultural uniformity. It also throws some light on another disputed problem of delinquency areas, the effects of social disorganization. The idea that crime and delinquency are a function of social disorganization has been widely accepted in American sociological literature. Applied to the housing estate as a causative factor in the aetiology of criminal behaviour the concept is of dubious value, if not positively misleading. The clustering of delinquents, persistent truants, problem families, mental defectives, and deprived children is found on the south side of the estate. On the other hand the north side is characterized by a higher rate of neurosis. Nevertheless, social communication between families on the south side appears stronger than on the north side where families have higher status aspirations and a desire for privacy and isolation which accompany these aspirations. A similar contrast was observed by the authors of the housing estate research published by Liverpool University Social Science Department, 'Neighbourhood and Community'. In so far as the absence of informal communication is an element in social disorganization the group of streets on the estate containing a high proportion of delinquents certainly does not justify the use of this term. In many respects the members of a delinquent subculture show clear evidence of social organization, though not necessarily in accordance with norms accepted by the wider society.

(iii) Further research into the delinquency area needs to be based on a multi-disciplinary approach. First and foremost there is the analysis of family behaviour. This may be understood best within the conceptual framework of unconscious motivation and also within the framework of social class and social status. The close relationship between the two is seen most clearly in the field of child-rearing. Certain norms of child-rearing among the low status families in the delinquency area appear to be traumatic in their effects on the personality development of the children. If preventive work, moreover, is to be effective with these families, then knowledge of the dynamics of personality development must be far greater among workers with families in delinquency areas than is generally the case. I refer to such workers as health visitors, social workers, and school welfare officers, and also to teachers in schools containing a high proportion of children from sub-cultural families.

Second, there is the continued need for research into the gang and the small group in the delinquency area, particularly into methods of working with gangs. The ways in which the gang recruits its members and retains or loses them, the inter-relationship between the withdrawn and the aggressive members, the rôle of the leader, and the effect of the norms of the gang on individual members *vis-à-vis* the educational and social influences of school or club are problems of great importance. On the action side we need to learn more about ways and means of collaboration between group-workers and case-workers with the family. In present circumstances the two carry out their work without that constant interchange of experience which is surely so essential.

Finally, in these remarks on new research needs I should mention the differential effect of life in a delinquency area on the various members of the family. We are wrong in thinking either of the area or of the family as a homogeneous unit. The impact of the social climate of the street may be more significant than that of the neighbourhood. In particular it may be more significant for the juvenile than for the adult. In urban society the social groups to which the adult belongs are not confined to the neighbourhood in which he lives but extend over various parts of the city. In the Bristol estate, for example, the adult is in general less likely to meet his friends in a local public house than he is in the centre of the city. Thus methods of crime prevention which assume a close connection between criminal behaviour and neighbourhood may easily fail through reliance on a false hypothesis.

JOHN SPENCER.

PRISON REFORM

I

The House of Lords debate on Prisons, 4th May, 1955, referred to in *Brit. J. Delinq.*, Vol. VI, p. 50, was followed by another, equally important one, on 31st July, 1956 (*Hansard*, Vol. 199, No. 126, cols. 426-88), introduced by Lord Moynihan. Its scope was as wide and its general level as high as on the previous occasion. While hardly a single aspect of prison administration was left untouched, special attention was again paid to the need to devise methods of treatment more suitable than imprisonment, in particular for first offenders and civil debtors; to conditions in local prisons, sanitation, overcrowding and homosexuality; to staffing, work and earnings, trade union attitudes, and after-care. Some of the speakers even took the view that first offenders should not, or only in exceptional cases, be sent to prison. There were some references to recent books by ex-prisoners such as Peter Wildeblood (*Brit. J. Delinq.*, Vol. VII, p. 73) and Norman Hignett (to be reviewed in our next issue). In his detailed reply, the Government spokesman, Lord Mancroft, was able to give some encouraging news: the number of prisoners sleeping three in one cell has gone down from 3,000 in 1955 to 2,000; there is an impressive building programme, and, among other improvements, 168 new workshops and laundries have been built, 20 old heating systems replaced, new electricity systems installed in 35 prisons, and cell lighting has been raised from 20 to 40 watts and will, as soon as possible,

be further raised to 60 watts. Lord Mancroft admitted that, in spite of improvements in the recesses of over 100 prison wings, in some prisons sanitary conditions were still unsatisfactory and that there was also room for innovations regarding prisoners' earnings. Dealing with the fundamental problem of relations between prisoners and prison officers he made a brief reference to certain new developments, and while we hope to return to the whole subject of prison reform in connection with the forthcoming Annual Report of the Prison Commission for the year 1955, we are now publishing below a short Note on that all-important issue by Mr. Klare, Secretary of the Howard League for Penal Reform. We are here faced with a problem of international dimensions, and it is interesting to see that experiments in some ways similar to those sketched by Mr. Klare are being made in California. In the June 1956 number of *Federal Probation*, Dr. Norman Fenton, Deputy Director of the California Department of Corrections, describes the establishment in some of their institutions of a system of 'group counselling' which, in contrast to 'group therapy' as applied by psychiatrists and psychologists, is conducted by 'correctional officers, shop foremen, teachers, and others', in short 'by those who are in most frequent and lengthy daily contact with the inmates ... the human beings in charge must be permitted to be treatment minded'. While admitting that it is too early to assess results, Dr. Fenton regards the position of Folsom Prison, where the system has been in operation longest, as very encouraging.

H. M.

II

Until fairly recently, developments in the institutional treatment of adult offenders in this country were characterized by the endeavour to take more and more categories of prisoners away from local prisons and to put them into establishments with a more constructive régime. Thus stars and ordinaries are being channelled off into Regional Training Centres or open prisons, trainable habitual offenders to Corrective Training prisons of various kinds, and non-trainable habitual offenders to Preventive Detention prisons of which there are now three. With respect to this last category, it may be noted that although preventive detainees are theoretically considered as no longer reformable, and the sentence they serve is regarded primarily as a method of protecting society and not as a means of rehabilitation, the attempt to help such long-sentence offenders to get through their sentence in practice amounts to a régime which might well be imposed for the specific purpose of reform, and which is certainly more constructive than the régime for first offenders and others at local prisons. Characterized as it is by a reasonably long working day, a good deal of association, and the possibility of completing the sentence in semi-liberty, preventive detention, in spite of its negative aim, is paradoxically and happily distinguished by many positive methods.

The net result of draining off these various categories of prisoners from local prisons was to turn them, in the words of Lord Mancroft, into the 'sump of the prison system'. However, it is encouraging that recently a number of plumbing operations have begun or are at any rate being planned. Apart from such minor but welcome matters as the improvement of sanitary recesses, and of lighting

and heating arrangements, they fall under the general heading of human relations, and concentrate in particular upon the rôle of the ordinary discipline officer in local prisons.

The first official move to get discipline officers interested in subjects outside their normal custodial duties came a year ago, when a system of joint consultation was initiated at which representatives of all levels of the prison service are able to discuss policy matters and are encouraged to put forward their suggestions and recommendations to the Prison Commission. The system is modelled along the lines current in industry ; but the Commissioners realized that joint consultation alone is of little value unless it is accompanied by some actual change in the status and rôle of the discipline officer, and by some degree of responsible participation in the work of rehabilitation. To this end, it was decided some months ago to hold an informal meeting consisting of some Governors, chief officers, and a representative of the Prison Officers' Association to discuss the subject of ' Training in Local Prisons '. The meeting concluded that the foundations of progress in this matter must be the development of a more constructive relationship between the discipline officer and the prisoner. Various suggestions were made which might lead to a change in staff attitudes, and it was decided that a small local prison should be designated at which a new approach might be tried.

The procedure which the Commissioners have here adopted is significant. Recognizing that changes in attitude and feelings cannot be forced, they allowed the suggestion regarding the change in the discipline officer's rôle to come up at this meeting rather than impose it upon an unwilling and unprepared service. So far, so good ; but if any change in the rôle, status and attitude of the discipline officer was in fact to come about, this in turn depended upon the willingness of local prison Governors to delegate responsibility and to draw the individual officer by various means closer into a team with a common therapeutic outlook. To do this, Governors would have to recognize the inner reasons for the antagonism to reform and the hostility to prisoners which discipline officers were sometimes prone to feel, and to help them to understand the anxieties which a more tolerant attitude would release.

The next step, therefore, was to focus the three-day Annual Governors' Conference on the subject of human relations. Again, the suggestion was allowed to come up from amongst the Governors themselves ; and the conference provided encouraging evidence of a willingness to rethink the present position. Finally, Norwich Prison has now been designated as the institution in which attempts will be made to change the rôle of the discipline officer. This will probably be done by encouraging him to take a personal interest in a number of prisoners specially allotted to him, and by arranging case-conferences with the Governor, at which the prisoners' problems can be discussed. If matters are handled wisely, these case-conferences could become extremely important. They could help the discipline officer to enter into the prisoners' problems more fully, and with gradually greater understanding ; and they would at the same time also afford an opportunity for him to express his own reactions and anxieties. The Governor, while guiding the discipline officer in a rough sort of case-work with prisoners, would in fact be doing case-work with him and would have to give him the support and understanding he would need if he is to be helped to develop a more tolerant attitude.

It is not to be expected that all discipline officers would, and could, respond to such an opening out of their duties. Those able to accept the new challenge, however, might find themselves gradually becoming members of a team bent on making the treatment of prisoners more constructive, and able to look upon their own job with a greater sense of satisfaction. In their case, the difference in attitude between Governor and discipline officer, strongly marked in many local prisons, would narrow or disappear; and in turn, any mutual hostility between prisoner and discipline officer might be similarly affected.

The Norwich experiment could prove to be of considerable importance in the institutional treatment of offenders in this country. If successful, it could be extended to other local prisons and might eventually attract a new type of candidate into the prison service. The problem of extension, however, is beset with difficulties. Most of our local prisons are too large, and their administration too time-consuming, to permit such changes in the régime; and the time is approaching when the Prison Commission will have to give serious consideration to the possibility of splitting the larger establishments into smaller, more or less independent units. Efforts should also be made to keep out of prison all those minor offenders who do not require institutional treatment, and it is to be hoped that the Home Office Advisory Council, which is now studying the question of alternatives to imprisonment, will soon be able to put forward some positive recommendations. Finally, attempts should be made to free Governors from certain administrative duties so that they can give more time to the human beings in their charge, whether they be prisoners or members of their own staff.

HUGH J. KLARE.

A NEW INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY AND A NEW JOURNAL

A new international body, the 'Société internationale de Prophylaxie sociale' (l'ancienne 'Ligue de défense de l'homme contre le crime'), has recently been founded, with headquarters in Paris, 12 bis place Henri Bergson, and its own three-monthly journal, the *Etudes internationales de Psycho-Sociologie criminelle*, with M. V. V. Stanciu, Professeur à l'Ecole Supérieure d'Anthropo-biologie de Paris, as editor-in-chief. The first issue, dated July-September 1956, contains, among other contributions, articles in French, Italian, and English, by Professors Alfredo Niceforo, Rome; George Heuyer, Paris (on aggression in children); V. V. Stanciu, Paris (on the definition of criminology); Enrico Altavilla, Naples. Mr. B. Mendelsohn, Jerusalem writes on 'The Victimology' and advocates the establishment of an International Society of Victimology, an academic chair and an International Congress on this 'new branch of science', and finally the creation of a special fund to compensate victims of crimes, and 'victimological' clinics. No doubt, the study of the victim of crime is an important subject, and in recent years it has been treated in several interesting publications not mentioned by the author. Apart from its political aspects, however, which are in any case outside the scope of scientific study, the matter can safely be left to criminology and the other social sciences already in existence. There seems to be no justification for the elaborate machinery envisaged by Mr. Mendelsohn.

H. M.

CRITICAL NOTICES

KRIMINOLOGI (CRIMINOLOGY). By Ivar Agge and others. (Stockholm : Wahlström and Widstrand. 1955. 429 pp.)

This book appears as Vol. I of a series, 'Kriminologisk Handbok' (Handbook of Criminology), edited by Karl Schlyter. There are six volumes in all, covering different disciplines concerned with the study of crime. Vol. III (on the system of penal sanctions), Vol. IV (on the prosecution of crime), Vol. V (on forensic psychiatry) and Vol. VI (on forensic medicine) have appeared previously. Vol. II (on prevention and restraint of crime) is in preparation. Whereas the term criminology in the title of the whole series is taken in a very broad sense, the present volume deals primarily with criminology in the narrow sense of description and causal explanation of criminal behaviour. How criminals should be treated is discussed only incidentally.

The volume consists of contributions from nine different authors, representing different sciences and approaches. The largest contributions are made by Ivar Agge, professor of law, on 'The Science of Criminology'; Bo Gerle, psychiatrist, on 'Criminal Biology'; Torgny Segerstedt, professor of sociology, on 'Criminal Sociology'; Olof Kinberg, professor emeritus of psychiatry, on 'Basic Problems of Criminology'. The Swedish-American professor, Thorsten Sellin, has written a historical introduction, the sociologists Gunnar Boalt and Carl-Gunnar Janson have dealt with some specific problems of criminal sociology, and Maths Heuman, Director of Public Prosecutions, and Sven Rengby, statistician, have discussed jointly some problems of criminal statistics.

Employing different authors is the only way for an editor to present a work where the different aspects of criminology can be treated with first-hand expert knowledge. On the other hand, the method has some disadvantages. A considerable amount of overlapping is present, and some readers will perhaps regret a certain lack of unity and integration in the different points of view. But, varied as it is, the work gives a representative presentation of Swedish criminology to-day. One regrets that language difficulties make the work and achievement of Scandinavian criminologists to a great extent inaccessible to the rest of the world. Especially in Sweden much valuable research has been carried out. Scandinavian criminology takes on the whole a middle position between the largely biological orientation in continental criminology and the dominating sociological orientation in American criminology. The grand old man of Swedish criminology, Olof Kinberg, has a strong biological orientation, but despite his eminent position in the Scandinavian countries, it could not be said that his views are generally accepted there.

A few somewhat arbitrarily chosen points in the present volume are here singled out for comment.

In a well-balanced discussion of the scope, methods, and ends of criminological science Professor Agge rightly points out the importance of obtaining reliable information of the volume and composition of crime as the basis for more thoroughgoing research. In his opinion the phenomenology of crimes has often been neglected, with the result that criminologists in their efforts to explain the causes of crime have built hypotheses and doctrines on too uncertain or incom-

plete factual knowledge. In connection with this point he underlines the desirability of research concentrated on specific forms of crime, including offences outside the more serious transgressions with which traditional criminology has been predominantly occupied. Furthermore, he underlines that understanding of the normal is fundamental to comprehending a pathological phenomenon as crime. 'It is against a background of experiences in normal psychology and normal sociological relations that results and hypotheses of criminology proper should be presented' (p. 45). Thus the study of the sociopsychological mechanisms of law-obedience is as important as the study of criminality itself. May the reviewer add as a reflection of his own that the psychiatrists have dominated too strongly in European criminology, partly due to the great prestige of the medical profession, partly to the empirical material they have at their disposal from their professional work as expert witnesses or in prison administration. The psychologist has had neither such professional prestige nor similar practical possibilities. The psychiatrist's view of crime problems naturally tends to be dominated by his experience, which is largely limited to serious misdeeds, often committed by persons with psychic disturbances, and thus not representative of the whole body of criminality.

Professor Agge has also an interesting discussion of the concept of cause in criminological research. The impossibility of complete exploration of the individual personality, the complexity of interplay between an individual and his environment, the impossibility of making experiments—all these circumstances make Professor Agge highly sceptical as to the possibility of explaining scientifically the cause of any one crime, not to mention crime in general. He would definitely abolish the idea that the central aim of the science of criminology is exploring the causes of crime, at least if the concept of causation is taken in its traditional meaning within the empirical sciences, which insist on strict verification of the accepted hypotheses. For practical purposes the establishment of co-variations is sufficient—at least as a starting point—for social and penal reform.

This somewhat resigned view is not shared by all the other contributors. Professor Segerstedt in his survey of criminal sociology bluntly states that the purpose of criminology is to explain the causes of the non-conforming behaviour called crime. Despite his quite different approach, Professor Kinberg is much of the same opinion. Kinberg, who is now over 80 but still very active, gives a stimulating and thought-provoking, although on some points no doubt challengeable, presentation of his views on crime and crime causation developed through a long life of research and discussion. In his view criminology is essentially a *clinical* science. Through the study of individual cases it gives a causal explanation of the crime as the reaction of the individual personality to a certain situation, and on this basis it finds a rational treatment—that is, a treatment which eliminates the causes of the symptoms. Without knowledge of the aetiology of criminal phenomena, we shall never be able to find a rational and efficient treatment. Kinberg pays a warm tribute to Lombroso as the founder of empirical clinical criminology. In Kinberg's opinion the essence of the Lombrosian theory, *i.e.* that criminality very often depends on diseases and cerebral lesions, has been corroborated in a way which Lombroso himself could not foresee. This insistence on the frequency and importance of cerebral disturbances due to traumata or infectious diseases as a causal factor in crime, is characteristic not only for

Kinberg himself, but for many other Swedish psychiatrists as well. For the psychoanalytic approach to the problem of crime Kinberg has nothing but scorn. He speaks of 'the clichés used within the psychoanalytical conceptual system, which are based on unverified and unverifiable postulates, unperceivable events, mythological anthropomorphisms, and teleological notions' (p. 418). He also directs his polemic against those sociologists who do not pay sufficient attention to the biological endowment of the individual. Again and again he emphasizes that the situation, the environment, is not something objectively given, but something which is highly dependent on the perception and attitudes of the individual. A situation or environment which may be disastrous for one individual can be indifferent or even beneficial for another, and it is impossible to explain the reactions of the individual without taking into account its biological constitution.

Scandinavian criminology is much indebted to Dr. Schlyter, who, besides his tireless work as a penal reformer, has succeeded in presenting this valuable volume, covering the different aspects of the criminological science.

JOHS ANDENAEES.

THEORY AND METHOD IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES. By Arnold M. Rose. (The University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1954. xii and 351 pp. \$5).

The phrase that it is impossible in a short review to do justice to the book concerned is only too true of Professor Arnold Rose's important collection of essays. Although criminological topics are directly touched upon in only a few chapters this book will be invaluable to the serious student of criminology and its methodology. The five general headings under which the material is arranged, *i.e.* 'Social Theory', 'Values in Social Research', 'The Contributions of Sociological Theory to the other Social Sciences', 'Methodological Issues in Sociology', and 'Some Specific Techniques of Sociological Research', will give but little indication of the rich variety of the twenty-two chapters. From our specific point of view, the most interesting chapters are the following: 2, The Problem of Mass Society; 7, The Selection of Problems for Research; 8, Where Social Action and Social Research Meet; 9, The Social Responsibility of the Social Scientist; 12, The Hiatus between Sociology and Psychology; 13, Problems in the Sociology of Law and Law Enforcement; 14, Problem Orientation versus Method Orientation; 15, Generalizations in the Social Sciences; 16, Conditions of the Social Science Experiment; 17, A Weakness of Partial Correlation in Sociological Studies. According to the author, the collection is not intended to give a systematic exposition of research techniques; its main purpose is to show how techniques found useful or even indispensable in other fields, especially the experimental and statistical, have to be adapted to the specific needs of sociology—and, we might add, of criminology, too (p. vii).

A chapter with some direct bearing on the work of the criminologist and the criminal lawyer is No. 13. Here the author tries to show how sociological techniques might be useful to the legislator and the judge. While complaining that the sociology of law does not seem to interest the lawyer as much as it does the sociologist, he admits that social scientists have in fact done very little so far to measure the effect of important pieces of legislation or of court decisions. Where,

in rare instances, American legislative Committees have made attempts to employ social research techniques, they have, Dr. Rose believes, not always made use of all those methods now available to social scientists, and in Great Britain and Sweden more has been done, he thinks, to prepare the ground for important social legislation. While this is true in general, his point about the desirability of a wider use of modern research techniques is to some extent probably applicable everywhere (see for a similar criticism of the work of the Royal Commission on Capital Punishment this Journal, Vol. IV, p. 170). Even more handicapped in this respect is the judge whose work only too often forces him to make general assumptions about social conditions without having at his disposal the powers of the legislator and administrator to instigate research. Occasionally, this may be done for him by outside bodies as in the recent case reported by Dr. Rose on the issue of Negro school segregation where 'thirty-two social scientists formulated a brief *amicus curiæ* which summarized social science studies relevant to this point'. In one respect the author regards conditions in the United States as particularly favourable to sociological research in the legal sphere because of the existence of different state legislations which, by providing suitable control groups, makes it easier to test the effect of controversial laws. This may be true in some cases, whereas in other instances conditions in states having different types of legislation may be too different even within the U.S.A. for such comparisons to be fully conclusive. Not without justification, Dr. Rose draws attention to the scarcity of sociological studies on the effect of judicial decisions and, where such studies have been made, to what he calls the lack of communication of their findings to the judges. Here the question arises whether the judges concerned would actually wish to be informed of, and are likely to be interested in, the findings of sociologists and criminologists. To arouse the interest of the judiciary and magistracy in sociological studies of their sentencing policy more is needed than the mere communication of such findings. In connection with his remarks on judicial sentencing the author makes a passing reference to a study of considerable interest which he published separately soon after the present book¹ and the object of which was to show that there were some significant discrepancies, first, between the severity of the penalties provided by law for the various offences and of the penalties actually imposed by the courts and, secondly, between these two and the popular view as to how severe these penalties should be. In other words, sociological research techniques were used to examine how far the courts had moved away from the views expressed by the legislator on the comparative seriousness of the various offences and how far the views of certain sections of the public had moved away from those of the judges. Whereas comparisons of the first type have occasionally been made before (*e.g.* by Franz Exner, in Germany), there is hardly any other material available of the second type. An attempt was also made in Dr. Rose's study to discover how far the views of the community on the seriousness of certain crimes were dependent on such factors as social background, occupation, sex. The stage has not yet been reached, however, when definite results can be presented on such matters to judges and magistrates. In this sphere research is still far less advanced than in the adjacent field of prediction

¹ Arnold M. Rose and Arthur E. Prell, 'Does the Punishment Fit the Crime?' A Study in Social Valuation. (*Amer. J. Sociol.*, Vol. 61. No. 3. November 1955.)

studies, but even if much more were already known about the sociological and psychological backgrounds of sentencing policy it would still have to be asked by whom and how this knowledge should be communicated to the courts. Probably Dr. Rose's formula, presented in another chapter (pp. 166-7)—controversial though it is—holds good that sociologists should not advocate that people should act in such and such a way, but merely point out that, if in the light of their findings it should appear desirable to achieve a certain goal, this would be the way to achieve it. If, for example, judges and magistrates should wish their sentences to conform to the views of certain sections of the community they would have to change their policy in a certain direction; it is for them, however, and not for the criminologist to decide how they should act. This, as the author stresses in particular in Chapter 7 and, more specifically, in a slightly later paper on 'Sociology and the Study of Values',² should not lead to the misunderstanding that social scientists should try to ignore values or to exclude them from their researches—'they do and inevitably must have value premises' (p. 165), and, naturally, their value premises will play an important, often even a decisive, part in their selection of problems for research. All we can expect from the social scientist is that he should be aware of this and make his value premises explicit. Since Max Weber, forty years ago, published his famous paper, not mentioned by Dr. Rose, on 'Der Sinn der "Wertfreiheit" der soziologischen und ökonomischen Wissenschaften',³ there have been many, not always successful, attempts at further clarification, showing in Rose's view that sociology seems to be moving away from the uncompromisingly 'value-free' theories 'towards the stage of maturity where it may be able to use values as the more established sciences use them (both in policy-making and in extending knowledge) and to help study values as they operate in science'.⁴ There is, however, John Madge's recent warning to the social scientist that if he is now encouraged 'to adopt an actively and openly selective point of view, he has the duty of choosing one which is at least reconcilable with the values of the society that he serves'.⁵ A truly formidable task which, if taken seriously, would in each single case first of all require the discovery of those societal values. And what if no consensus of opinion can be reached as to what they are, as, for example, in the case of capital punishment? In fact, no such duty as that postulated by John Madge can be accepted by social scientists.

Of the many other points in Dr. Rose's book with some special bearing on criminological research only a few can here be mentioned: Chapter 16 contains an excellent analysis of some of the difficulties which the social scientist has to overcome when trying to experiment: it is more difficult for him than for the natural scientist to find a suitable control group, to hold interfering conditions constant; his experimental findings will usually apply only to the group on which the experiment was performed; and the stimulus which he applies is often not specific enough: 'he frequently finds that his stimulus is a complex of elements some of which he has no control over, and each of which may have a different

² *Brit. J. Sociol.*, Vol. VII. No. 1. March 1956.

³ Max Weber, 'Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre', (Tubingen 1922), pp. 451-502 (reprinted from 'Logos', Vol. 7, 1917-18).

⁴ *Brit. J. Sociol.*, Vol. VII, p. 14.

⁵ John Madge, 'The Tools of Social Science', (London 1953), p. 16.

effect on the experimental group' (p. 277). Who would not be reminded of the fate of one of the biggest experiments in recent criminological research, the Cambridge-Somerville Study (this Journal, Vol. III, p. 209) ?

The same healthily sceptical attitude pervades Chapter 15 on 'Generalizations in the Social Sciences': 'When social scientists seek generalizations about all human beings . . . their samples are invariably non-representative' and, consequently, there is much overgeneralization from limited samples and 'a growing science by analogy'. This leads the author to the demand for more replication studies. A list of such studies, which includes a few criminological studies (pp. 268-72), shows that 'there is little consistency in the conclusions of the studies reported', and it is of course all-important to examine the reasons for this and to produce more consistent replications (p. 263).

Chapter 17 on partial correlations will be of interest to all those criminologists using statistical techniques, but only two of its conclusions may be mentioned: 'the sociologist who uses partial correlations is guilty of fallacious reasoning unless he has independent outside knowledge of cause-and-effect relations . . . before he holds any factors constant' (pp. 288-9), and 'the partial correlation is widely misconceived to be a step in the direction of causal explanation . . . ' (p. 285).

H. M.

REVIEWS

THE SUBNORMAL MIND. By Professor C. Burt. (London : O.U.P. 1955. Pp. 391. 20s.)

Professor Burt was a pioneer in the field of clinical and educational psychology. His report on educational ability in London (1916) is a classic of its kind. Much of what he has included in his earlier writings now finds general acceptance and application. This is true, for example, of his insistence on the needs of the patient as an individual and of his objection to the mechanical approach to disease entities implicit in much of former medical teaching. His statement that the task of the physician is not so much to investigate the individual as the interaction between the individual and his surroundings is, in these days of the rapid development of social medicine, accepted as axiomatic. In the field of mental retardation Burt was one of the first to draw attention to the high prevalence of scholastic backwardness in the poorer areas.

Despite progress in understanding the social basis of disease this aspect of medical teaching still leaves much to be desired. It is possible to search through an authoritative modern text-book of pædiatrics and to find little mention of social and psychological aspects of health and disease. Further, as Professor Burt points out in the new edition of his text-book on 'The Subnormal Mind', although certain diseases are now recognized as being 'psycho-somatic' there is still a general failure to recognize that all diseases are necessarily psycho-somatic since there is an essential unity between body and mind.

Many other of the statements in this volume are important and can hardly be

repeated too often. In dealing with children he points out the difficulties which often beset an attempt to adjust the child to the environment and emphasizes that frequently a more fruitful approach consists of attempting to adjust the environment to the child. In opposing undue emphasis on disease entities he draws attention to the unreliability of subjunctive impressions of mental level and indicates in particular the unreliability of the so-called 'stigmata of degeneracy' including low foreheads, high, narrow or V-shaped palates. He points out that few normal individuals are without one such 'stigma'. This is a useful antidote to the overemphasis on such details which has persisted until recent times (Tredgold, 1952).

It may be felt, however, that Professor Burt, in pleading for scientific accuracy in the estimation of mental defect, overstates his case when he says that techniques for testing the innate intelligence of children have proved singularly accurate. Psychologists have, of recent years, become increasingly cautious in interpreting test results and there are now few who would claim that any test is absolutely 'culture-free' or uninfluenced by the experience of the child. As long ago as 1935 Klineberg summarized the results of the work of many psychologists showing the difficulties in interpretation due to economic, social, educational and personal problems. In 1955 Vernon in his presidential address to the British Psychological Society emphasized the importance of the environmental contribution to test results.

In dealing with delinquency Professor Burt stresses the importance of environmental factors but in this connection he also advances views which no longer receive general support. Woodward (1955) has convincingly reviewed the evidence against his generalization: '... those who perpetrate crimes are usually simpletons. Most rogues are fools.'

BRIAN H. KIRMAN.

MENS REA IN STATUTORY OFFENCES. By J. LI. J. Edwards. 'English Studies in Criminal Science', Vol. VIII. (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. Pp. xiv and 297 (including Index and Bibliography). 21s. net.)

English academic lawyers have acquired a reputation (which is not altogether undeserved) for being zealous in pulling the judgments of the courts to pieces, and showing how this phrase or that construction on the part of the learned judges is wholly indefensible or a departure from principle. This is in no way surprising, for critical analysis of current legal development is part of their job. But they must not feel put out if members of the judiciary occasionally fight back or the profession reels with scorn to the controversies which excite professors. Nor must they mind if persons who look upon the law from the lofty pinnacles of some other profession sometimes wonder what all the fuss is about, and condemn the law as being too concerned with logic or semantics, historical principle or hoary precedent. For, as Dr. Edwards' elaborate study of the principle of mens rea in statutory offences shows, the careful sifting of judgments, weighing them in the light of the fundamental principle that a man is not to be held guilty of crime unless he had what is euphemistically termed a guilty mind, is a process which is very revealing and most helpful for the future, and may safeguard one of the

basic liberties of the subject. Like the old-time schoolmaster who corrected spelling mistakes with an almost moral or religious fervour, Dr. Edwards points out the errors, confusions and oversights of the bench, and shows the way in which these may be avoided.

Dr. Edwards' method is to subject each of the key words which are frequently found in the definition of statutory offences to scholarly examination. The words 'maliciously', 'wilfully', 'knowingly', 'fraudulently', 'permits', 'causes', 'suffers' and 'allows', are each examined in turn in relation to a wide variety of different criminal offences. His thesis is that the presence of any one of these words clearly involves the necessity of proof of *mens rea* or guilty intention on the part of the defendant. The book concludes with a chapter on 'The Criminal Degrees of Knowledge', in which the author persuasively shows that negligence is sufficient to create liability under certain statutes and that such liability is acceptable in these limited connections. This, of course, involves accepting liability in the absence of any *mens rea* in the sense of dishonest conduct or guilty intent, which is contrary to Dr. Edwards' main thesis. Moreover, acceptance of negligence as a basis of criminal liability is likely to be strongly resisted by the legal profession because of the dangers which may follow from any extension of that kind of liability to crimes other than minor statutory contraventions. The reluctance to extend vicarious liability is well illustrated in the chapter devoted to that subject. The book ends with a chapter summarizing the discussion.

It is well known to lawyers that there have been changes in fashion in relation to liability for minor statutory offences. At one time, from about 1875 onwards, there was a tendency to eliminate the requirement of *mens rea* almost completely from such cases. But during and after World War II there was a sharp reaction against such strict liability, and nowadays only where the statute clearly imposes this will the courts be prepared to hold a person guilty notwithstanding that he did not know that he was committing the offence. Dr. Edwards' method of studying the subject precludes him from satisfactorily accounting for these changes or explaining why it is that in certain cases strict liability is retained, for he is solely concerned with the implication of the epithets or key words under examination, and although he does occasionally hint at the broader issues, the book is disappointingly limited by the fact that the approach is analytical and not sociological in any degree.

Dr. Edwards quotes from Bacon to the effect that 'words are like a Tartar's bow, they shoot back upon the understanding of the wisest, and mightily entangle and pervert the judgment' (p. 51). One is reminded of the passage in 'Alice Through the Looking Glass', where Humpty-Dumpty says, 'When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less.' 'The question is,' said Alice, 'whether you can make words mean so many different things.' 'The question is,' said Humpty-Dumpty, 'which is to be master—that's all.' Like a good lawyer, Dr. Edwards has conceded that words shall be master in the context of *mens rea* in statutory offences but has not really explained why anyone should have held otherwise. Nevertheless, his study will provide much food for thought and ground for legal argument for the future.

J. E. HALL WILLIAMS.

DIE RICHTERLICHE STRAFZUMESSUNG. By Dr. Hellmuth von Weber. (Juristische Studiengesellschaft Karlsruhe, Schriftenreihe Heft 24. Verlag C. F. Müller, Karlsruhe. 1956. Pp. 29. DM 1.80.)

Judicial sentencing policy can be examined theoretically in various ways, the most important of which are: (1) discussion of the general principles behind such a policy; the way in which they are expressed in Criminal Codes and Statutes and applied by the courts; their relation to the idea of justice and the objects of punishment or treatment; (2) statistical examination of the kind and length of sentences actually imposed by certain courts over a period of time for the various kinds of offences; local, regional and national variations; differences between individual courts and judges; and so on; (3) sociological and psychological studies of the background of judicial sentences; attempts to explain the statistical findings by way of further statistical or individual case study analysis in terms of the social backgrounds of judges and magistrates, their ages, sex, professional or lay status, religion, etc.; investigations of sentencing policy in relation to the views of the various sections of the community regarding the severity of specific types of offences, and so on.

Often there is a considerable amount of overlapping and combination in that, for example, studies of primarily statistical character (2) are also concerned with the sociological-psychological background (3) or with the philosophical-legal principles of sentencing policy (1). Professor Arnold Rose, in the book reviewed above, asks such questions as 'What is the effect on a judge of a "moral position" taken by the church to which he belongs; do catholic judges, for example, take a severer view of abortion than their protestant colleagues?' (p. 240), *i.e.* questions of the kind referred to under (3). Professor von Weber's Karlsruhe lecture, on the other hand, belongs essentially to category (1). He deals, first, with the legal problem how far the German Supreme Court has power to alter sentences passed by lower courts. Although this problem is discussed with reference to the relevant provisions of German criminal law and procedure it is one which, in one form or another, has to be faced in every legal system. Rightly, the author stresses the indisputable need for some sort of control by the superior court without underestimating the difficulties arising from the equally indisputable fact that the higher court cannot, as a rule, know all the considerations which had been in the minds of the judges passing the sentence; and he is also conscious of the importance of irrational and essentially imponderable factors as well as of, possibly justifiable, differences in local and regional attitudes towards the various crimes and the appropriate penalties. Finally, and this is of particular interest to criminologists, von Weber discusses the contributions which criminology can make towards a more rational and scientific sentencing policy by providing the empirical knowledge of the characteristics of crimes and criminals and of their significance to the community as a whole. Empirical studies of this kind are, he stresses, often more important than dogmatic controversies over points of criminal law.

H. M.

In the same series the following lectures, also delivered before the Juristische Studiengesellschaft Karlsruhe, are of interest to criminologists:

No. 12 : F. PIETRUSKY. Über den medizinischen Vaterschaftsnachweis und die Bewertung seiner Untersuchungsergebnisse nach dem heutigen Stande der Wissenschaft. (On the medical proof of paternity and an assessment of its results according to present-day knowledge.)

No. 14 : HELLMUTH EHRHARDT. Chemische und Psychische Aussagebeeinflussung. (Chemical and psychological factors influencing evidence.)
(D.M. 1.80 each.)

THE PROOF OF GUILT. A Study of the English Criminal Trial. The Hamlyn Lectures. Seventh Series. By Glanville Williams. (London : Stevens & Sons Limited. 1955. Pp. vii + 294. 17s. 6d.)

In this smallish book, the seventh series of the Hamlyn Trust lectures, delivered in 1955 at Birmingham University, has become available to a wider public. The Trust was founded in 1941 with the object of furthering 'among the Common People of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the knowledge of the Comparative Jurisprudence and the Ethnology of the chief European countries, including the United Kingdom, and the circumstances of the growth of such jurisprudence to the intent that the Common People of the United Kingdom may realise the privileges which in law and custom they enjoy in comparison with other European Peoples and realising and appreciating such privileges may recognise the responsibilities and obligations attaching to them'. It would be doing an injustice to the memory of the Founder of the Trust, however, if one were to conclude from this wording that the superiority of English law was to be uncritically accepted by the lectures. Dr. Glanville Williams' unbiased approach to the problems of comparative criminal law is too well-known to arouse any doubt in this direction, and the same can be said, in their respective spheres, of his eminent predecessors in this series.

The scope of the present four lectures is much wider than suggested by the title; the sub-heading is perhaps more appropriate, and the book as a whole might well be called a short treatise on the English law of criminal courts and criminal procedure and a valuable supplement to the author's standard work on 'Criminal Law' (*Brit. J. Delinq.*, Vol. V., p. 78). In the first chapter on 'The Evolution of the English Trial', where the author's historical knowledge is shown at its best, he stresses that, though there are certainly some good grounds for complacency, the English system of criminal justice is not perfect and that 'we can profitably copy from other countries on a few points'. And, after a remarkably objective survey of the whole scene, on the last two pages he draws up the balance-sheet of the English system on the credit side as follows: the 'reticent attitude maintained by the judge during the abduction of evidence', in other words, the accusatory as against the inquisitorial system of the Continent; the common law practice of cross-examination; the rules of corroboration and those excluding prejudicial evidence of bad character. On the debit side stand, with all due reservations, the jury and the lay and stipendiary magistrates, topics to which particularly searching and illuminating chapters, filling nearly one third of the book, are devoted. The jury system especially comes in for some truly devastating,

but well-deserved, criticism 'if one proceeds by the light of reason' (p. 207). However, the author is much too wise and experienced an observer of the legal scene not to know for how little reason accounts in such matters. In favour of the jury, he stresses that wrong convictions are rare, certainly rarer than wrong acquittals. In the controversy 'lay or professional magistrates?'—a merely theoretical question as 'England is more firmly committed than ever to the lay system'—the author's verdict is that 'the best stipendiary is greatly superior to the ordinary run of lay justices' courts' (p. 276). However, as the present reviewer has pointed out elsewhere, should we not rather try to compare the best with the best, the average with the average, and the worst with the worst? The ideal solution, as Dr. Williams has clearly seen (pp. 233 and 294), lies in a combination of both lay and professional magistrates, as it is found in some Continental systems and in a few Magistrates' and Juvenile Courts in this country.

H. M.

THE CRIME PROBLEM. By Walter C. Reckless. Second edition. (New York, Appleton-Century-Croft, Inc. 1955. x and 728 pp.)

CRIMINOLOGY. By Donald R. Taft. Third edition. (New York, The Macmillan Company. Pp. x + 779. 45s. 6d.)

Two of the most valuable and most widely used American text-books on criminology have recently been re-issued in new editions, both of them enlarged and thoroughly brought up-to-date, both written from the sociological point of view. As Professor Reckless writes in his Preface, 'it is very hard for one person to assemble the data and information necessary to make a global study of crime'. As readers of this journal know, he spares no effort to make himself familiar with European conditions; even so, however, 'very hard' may be an understatement for which the present reviewer would rather substitute a clear 'impossible'. It is not altogether the fault of these two distinguished authors if their knowledge of systems outside the U.S.A. and of non-American literature, as it appears from their books, remains extremely scanty. With this proviso, both texts are very informative and useful to students of criminology everywhere. One of the great merits of Taft's book is his searching analysis of the part played by American culture in producing anti-social behaviour. Reckless, too, stresses the importance of social class in determining what he calls the 'categoric risks' in crime, but his discussion of the general problem is perhaps slightly less persuasive. Both authors are anxious to absolve American society of the responsibility for the American crime rate (Taft, p. 29; Reckless, p. 30).

H. M.

SEXUAL OFFENDERS AND SOCIAL PUNISHMENT. Compiled and edited by D. S. Bailey, Ph.D. (London: The Church Information Board. 1956. Pp. 120. 6s. 6d. net.)

THEY STAND APART. Edited by Judge Tudor Rees and Harley V. Usill. (London: Wm. Heinemann. 1955. Pp. 220. 21s. net.)

Stimulated in part no doubt by recent popular concern with the subject of

homosexuality and partly by the exploratory activities of the Departmental Committee on Homosexuality and Prostitution, the literature on sexual offenders waxes apace. Here we have the evidence submitted on behalf of the Church of England Moral Welfare Council to the Departmental Committee¹ and an omnibus volume in which the relations of homosexuality to the law, to society, to Christian morals, to psychological and organic medicine, together with a survey of the laws dealing with homosexuality in other European countries, and a critical study of statistics on the subject are dealt with respectively by Judge Tudor Rees, Lord Hailsham, the Revd. D. S. Bailey, Dr. Lindsay Neustatter, Dr. Hammelmann, and a member of the Howard League for Penal Reform. Incidentally the Church Council Report includes a lengthy appendix on Homosexuality and Christian Morals by the Revd. D. S. Bailey, the substance of which also appears in 'They Stand Apart'.

Of the Church report it is perhaps sufficient to note that it recommends the limitation of homosexual offences to the commission, attempted commission, or procurement of commission of homosexual acts, (a) with any person below the legal age of consent (which the report suggests should be raised to 17); (b) in circumstances constituting a public nuisance, or infringement of public decency, and (c) involving assault, violence, fraud or duress. Regarded as a scientific contribution to the problem, the booklet is inevitably superficial in scope and hampers itself with somewhat arbitrary definitions of 'inversion' and 'perversion'. The section on prostitution is erudite but unilluminating. It endorses the recommendations of the Association of Moral and Social Hygiene, mainly, that the terms 'prostitutes' or 'common prostitutes' and the phrase 'for the purpose of prostitution' should be omitted from the laws; and that the action of the State should be limited to protection of the citizen from annoyance or obstruction. The appendix on the Homosexual and Christian Morals is also erudite and represents an ingenious though perhaps not very successful attempt to resolve the dilemmas and confusions that arise in the mind of the Christian when the same problem is approached simultaneously from theological, social, legal and psychological angles.

Regarding the symposium edited by Tudor Rees and Usill, one cannot but regret that a book that purports to be a 'critical survey of the problem of homosexuality' should have been given the catchpenny title 'They Stand Apart'. Judge Tudor Rees' preliminary chapter on Homosexuality and the Law ranges diffusely over a variety of topics; moral and criminal responsibility, punishment, the implications of 'consent'. Of Lord Hailsham's essay on homosexuality and society it can only be said that, while no doubt entitled to appear in a popular symposium, it has no place in a critical survey and, not surprisingly, ends with the *ex cathedra* pronouncement: 'We have been right in attaching to male homosexuality both criminal and social sanctions.'

Passing over the contribution of the Revd. D. S. Bailey on the theological aspects of the problem (to which reference has been made above) we reach the really valuable sections of the book. Dr. Neustatter's review of the medical aspects of the problem is a well-organized, objective and temperate presentation

¹ The evidence of the B.M.A. Committee was reviewed in a Critical Notice, *Brit. J. Delinq.*, Vol. VI, p. 315.

by an experienced psychiatrist, and gives the intelligent layman as much factual information on the subject as he is likely to be able to digest without undue emotional reaction. Dr. Hammelmann follows with an excellent review of the legal position regarding homosexuality in other European countries. Incidentally, he concludes that the present English law and practice 'have no rival for severity . . . except possibly in Western Germany.' Finally a member of the Howard League for Penal Reform contributes a brief critical survey of statistics for Great Britain which underlines the absence of factual information on the subject.

Despite many serious reservations, 'They Stand Apart', is on margin a useful book.

E. G.

THE HOME MENDERS. : The Prevention of Unhappiness in Children. By Basil Henriques, C.B.E., M.A., J.P. (London : George Harrap & Co. Ltd. 1955. Pp. 192. 10s. 6d.)

This book is about young people at home, in play and in trouble. The author writes from long experience as a Juvenile Court Magistrate and Settlement Worker in London's East End. He sees a 'close relationship between the broken home, the breakdown of religion, and the breakdown of the child', and discusses topics such as education for marriage and parenthood, the place of religion in the home and social services for child welfare.

Sir Basil outlines a scheme for the co-ordination, under a Ministry of Child Welfare, of work for young people now done by the Home Office, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labour (Youth Employment). Pending such drastic reorganization he would like to see the Children's Officer (Home Office) take over more of the work now done by the Education Authority. Truancy, for example, even in its early stages, can be a symptom of serious maladjustment. He would have this handled by a skilled case-worker who can help the family as well as the child, and not leave it to the School Attendance Officer to summons the parents (his only resource) when the situation has become serious. He would like to see the co-ordination of residential schools under one authority so that each child could be sent to the most suitable school, and the amalgamation of the work of the present remand homes and classifying schools into single observation centres.

The book should appeal to all who are interested, professionally or otherwise, in child welfare. It is vividly written and, although the reader may not agree with all the author's views, he will be forced to think seriously of why he disagrees.

K. EDKINS.

EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS OF CHILDHOOD. Edited by Dr. Gerald Caplan. (London : Tavistock Publications. 1956. Pp. 544. 42s.)

In 1954 the International Institute of Child Psychiatry met in Toronto after a preparatory commission had received and winnowed the collected communications at Copenhagen. After much labour the editor selected such case studies as he felt held together to form this substantial volume. The case studies and

research projects are very representative of the present position of child psychiatry, and of the outstanding problems which have attracted workers in this field. In one sense, it is also a memorial to the late Dr. Abraham Z. Borhash, who was Secretary-General of the Association, but who unfortunately died before the Congress met. Almost all the papers derive from Canada and the United States. France, however, is represented by Professor Heuyer and Dr. Aubry.

Mother-child relationships, and the disturbances concerned in these, receive very special attention, and the psychosomatic disorders also find a prominent place. The present interest in child psychosis has a sector to itself, and treatment is not so pessimistic as it was but a few years ago.

The research projects illustrate the complexity of factor patterns. The family life as a life-space in which development takes place is fully appreciated, but makes the subject all the more difficult, both for prognosis and diagnosis, although treatment is widened in scope. The editor devotes some space to a summing-up of preventive techniques and trends, and points out how deeply the community as a whole is involved. The volume brings into relief the fact that psychiatry is becoming a social, as well as a clinical, field.

This is an important volume for its matter, its suggestions, and for its limited optimism.

E. M.

THE INTERPERSONAL THEORY OF PSYCHIATRY. By Harry Stack Sullivan, M.D. (London : Tavistock Publications Ltd. 1953. Pp. 393. 35s.)

This is the work of America's leading psychiatrist who, like many others, stems from Freud but has departed from the basic teachings to formulate a doctrine based largely on interpersonal relations. These pages are from lecture notes published posthumously.

The exposition opens with an attempt at definition ; an effort which is not entirely free from ambiguities of language, which are not fully surmounted. Having laid down certain postulates regarding basic anxiety as a necessary prelude to action after choice is imposed by circumstances, he passes on to description of the phases of development, from the protaxis of infancy to the mature, or syntaxis, of adult experience ; the progression to adequate adaptation is an oscillation, or dialectic process. Nevertheless, despite the fairly rigorous analysis of the approach to interpersonal experience, he makes no mention of transference relationships, and in this measure, shows how far he has travelled from the parent theories of Freud.

The book, however, can be highly recommended as one of the most thoughtful prolongomena to psychiatry just outside the psychoanalytic domain.

E. M.

A HANDBOOK OF MEDICAL HYPNOSIS. By Gordon Ambrose and George Newbold. (London : Baillière, Tindall & Cox. 1956. Pp. 255. 21s.)

This excellent handbook is intended by the authors to serve as an introduction to the use of hypnosis for students and practitioners. It describes the applications of hypnosis in general medicine, the neuroses, surgery, pediatrics, gynæcology, obstetrics and dermatology. With a little elaboration of the chapter on the

hypnotic state and its phenomena, which is perhaps too synoptical, it would serve also as a reliable source of information for the general reader. A sub-section of the pediatric chapter deals with the use of hypnosis in delinquency. Throughout, the authors show considerable understanding of the unconscious and emotional factors involved. A very good book.

E. G.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(Inclusion in this list does not preclude a later review)

Books

- L. DE BRAY, J. TUERLINCKY. 'Social Casework.' Editions C.O.M.E.T.S., Bruxelles.
 CAROLINE BROWN. 'Lost Girls.' Victor Gollancz Ltd. 12s. 6d.
 GEORGE J. DUDYCHA. 'Psychology for Law Enforcement Officers.' Charles C. Thomas.
 BENJAMIN FINE. '1,000,000 Delinquents.' Victor Gollancz Ltd. 18s.
 GERALD GARDINER, Q.C. 'Capital Punishment as a Deterrent: and the Alternative.' Victor Gollancz Ltd. 6s.
 G. GODWIN. 'Crime and Social Action.' Watts & Co. 18s.
 SIR ERNEST GOWERS. 'A Life for a Life?' Chatto and Windus Ltd. 7s. 6d.
 LUDOVIC KENNEDY. 'Murder Story.' Victor Gollancz Ltd. 13s. 6d.
 MACPHERSON LAWRIE. 'Original Good.' C. W. Daniel Co. Ltd. 6s.
 HERTA LOEWY. 'Training the Backward Child.' Staples Press. 12s. 6d.
 MARIE NYSWANDER. 'The Drug Addict as a Patient.' Grune & Stratton, Inc. \$4.50.
 'Neurology and Psychiatry in Childhood.' Proceedings of the Association for Research in Nervous and Mental Disease. Vol. 34. Baillière, Tindall & Cox, Ltd. 18s.
 RUTH A. OAKLEY. 'Challenge to Heritage.' St. Catherine Press Ltd. 6s.
 CHARLES SCHOENFIELD. 'God and Country.' Philosophical Library, New York. \$3.
 S. R. SLAVSON. 'The Fields of Group Psychotherapy.' International Universities Press. \$6.
 GORDON YOUNG. 'Valley of Silence.' Robert Hale Ltd. 12s. 6d.

Reports

- Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. 'Travaux de la Semaine International de Strasbourg.'
 Ministère de la Justice. 'Rapports Generaux, 1954 & 1955.'
 JEAN PINATEL (ED.). 'Le Problème de l'Etat Dangereux.' Transactions of the Second International Course on Criminology. 1953.
 U.N. 'Cycle d'Etudes du Moyen orient sur la Prevention du Crime et le Traitement des Delinquents.'
 U.N. 'International Directory of Schools of Social Work.'
 U.N. 'Special Study on Social Conditions in Non-Self-Governing Territories.'
 U.N. Secretariat. 'International Survey of Programmes of Social Development.' 15s.

Pamphlets

- 'Helping Families.' Association of Children's Officers.
 'Capital Punishment: the heart of the matter.' V. Gollancz.
 'Historic Background of Group Psychotherapy.' S. B. Hadden.
 'The Police and the Mental Health of Children.' International Federation of Senior Police Officers.
 'Education and the Moral Basis of Citizenship.' ERIC JAMES. W. Heinemann. 1s. 6d.
 'Employment Problems of Former Offenders.' J. MELICHERICK. Canadian Welfare Council. 10 cents.
 'Generic Trends in Education for Social Work.' CHARLOTTE TOWLE.

ABSTRACTS AND REFERENCES

(Contributed by : W. R. Bett, W. J. Bolt, T. Grygier, J. P. Martin,
T. P. M. Morris, J. C. Spencer.)

CRIMINOLOGY

Yearbook of the Northern Association of Criminalists, 1954', Stockholm, 1955.

This reprint in French and English from the yearbook contains reports of the proceedings of the 1953 annual meeting of the Icelandic Association of Criminalists and the 1954 annual meetings of the Finnish, Swedish, Norwegian and Danish Associations. Among the subjects discussed were: psychiatric observation; after-care of prisoners in Sweden, in which strengthening the organization of probation officers was generally recommended; personal investigation and the guarantee of security afforded by the law in Norway, where the psychiatric experts are appointed by the court, and male prostitution, based on investigations into homosexual prostitution in Copenhagen, when it was agreed that (a) punishment of the young male prostitute was unwise, and (b) the protection of minors was most important.

J. C. S.

CLARENCE R. JEFFERY: 'The Structure of American Criminological Thinking', *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1956, **46**, 658-672.

This article examines the various interpretations put forward by American criminologists as to what constitutes a crime. The author contrasts the legalistic and sociological approach. He emphasizes the lack of attention given to the study of crime within an institutional framework. American criminology has developed in response to Positivism, that is, it has developed a systematic study of the criminal, but the interest in criminals and penology has obscured for the criminologist the relation of these problems to crime. A study of social systems in relation to the subject 'law and society' would eventually lead to a theory of crime.

J. C. S.

Symposium on Juvenile Delinquency: B. M. BECK: 'The Nature of Juvenile Delinquency', *Pediatrics*, 1956, **17**, 930-933; A. M. JOHNSON: 'Causation of Juvenile Delinquency', *ibidem*, 934-939; R. D. RABINOVITCH: 'Juvenile Delinquency: Considerations of Etiology and Treatment', *ibidem*, 939-946.

W. R. B.

A. RAUF: 'Physical Factors in the Causation of Juvenile Delinquency', *Medicus, Karachi*, (May) 1956, **12**, 56-59.

In Western countries children are less likely to become emotionally dissatisfied through physical disability because special provision is made for their care and education. The problem of the relationship of physical condition and behaviour in countries like Pakistan differs from that encountered in the Western World, and the author concludes that the experiences of Western investigators are of little use in assessing the effect of physical condition on delinquency in Pakistan.

W. R. B.

P. SCHUMM : 'Die Jugendkriminalität : Problemdarstellung und Bericht über die Literatur der Jahre 1945 bis 1955', *Fortschritte der Neurologie, Psychiatrie*, 1956, **24**, 281-321.

H. M. NORTH : 'On the Management of the Juvenile Sex Offender', *Medical Journal of Australia*, (April 28) 1956, *i*, 685-688. W.R.B.

PENOLOGY

EDITORIAL : 'Survey of the Administration of Criminal Justice', *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1955, **46**, 291-292.

A brief description is given of the proposed survey by the American Bar Foundation of the administration of Criminal Justice in representative jurisdictions, both State and Federal, of the United States. The Ford Foundation has granted \$200,000 for this five-year project which will cover four main divisions ; the police function ; prosecution and defence of criminal actions ; criminal courts, and probation, sentence and parole. The Director is Professor Arthur H. Sherry of the University of California Law School. J. C. S.

MORRIS G. CALDWELL : 'Group Dynamics in the Prison Community', *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1956, **46**, 648-657.

By group dynamics is meant the relationship between the formal personnel groups and the informal inmate groups in the prison community. The informal system exists as a very real threat and potent danger to the formal prison programme. A number of informal groups is differentiated and described, together with the status and leadership systems. Group formation in prison is a 'natural process' which cannot be thwarted but can be guided, and an understanding of it is essential to the development of a constructive therapeutic programme. J. C. S.

GEORGE H. WEBER : 'Clinical Approach to Selecting and Training Personnel for Institutions Serving Delinquents', *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1956, **47**, 33-45.

This paper presents some of the problems involved in the selection and training of workers in institutions. It examines some of the determining factors underlying the selection of workers, and the kinds of people making the more capable rehabilitation workers, as well as ways of selecting and training them. J. C. S.

SIR BASIL HENRIQUES : 'Attendance Centres', *The Magistrate*, 1956, **XII**, 62.

PSYCHIATRY

G. HEILBRUNN and M. FALSBERG : 'Juvenile Delinquency : Comments on Etiology', *Northwest Medicine*, 1956, **55**, 277-281.

Psychiatric studies of approximately 200 juvenile delinquents and of their families showed that the majority of the children had been denied the chance to acquire control over their innate impulses. Factors inside the family affecting

the children's behaviour were parental inadequacy to meet the child's needs; the absence or indifference of one parent placing excessive responsibility on the other; the child's sensitivity and parental lack of understanding; and inadequate training in apparently normal homes. Wartime upheavals, increase in employment of women and in the divorce rate, are other factors involved. Improvement in the situation lies in the treatment of children and parents.

W. R. B.

IRMI ELKAN: 'Interviews with Neglectful Parents', *British Journal of Psychiatric Social Work*, 1956, **3**, 3, 11-17.

A psychiatric social worker illustrates the problem of neglect with reference to case material derived from experience in a children's reception centre.

T. P. M. M.

BEN KARPMAN: 'A Paranoiac Murder', *Archives of Criminal Psychodynamics*, 1955, **1**, 908-939.

A case presentation underlying the dynamics of an irrational and impulsive murder.

T. G.

PSYCHO-ANALYSIS

DAVID RUMNEY: 'Incorporation, Instinct, Theory and Certain Delinquents', *Archives of Criminal Psychodynamics*, 1955, **1**, 809-831.

A theoretical exposition of some delinquency phenomena in the light of Melanie Klein's views on the dynamic processes of introjection, projection, and reintroduction.

T. G.

DANIEL LAGACHE: 'The Psychoanalysis of a Gangster', *Archives of Criminal Psychodynamics*, 1955, **1**, 832-865.

A very detailed case history presented as the result of interaction between individual experiences and constitutional determinants.

T. G.

PSYCHOTHERAPY

WILLIAM R. PERL: 'Therapeutic Use of Certain Defects of the Usual Prison', *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1956, **47**, 58-63.

Close confinement, with all its disadvantages, offers a unique, and insufficiently utilized opportunity for the treatment of the psychopath. It allows planned reduction to a minimum of his normal way of dissipating tension, thus offering systematic control and employment of his anxiety for treatment purposes. The authoritarian setting also satisfies strong dependent needs of the psychopath.

J. C. S.

H. MICHAEL ROSOW: 'Some Observations on Group Therapy with Prison Inmates', *Archives of Criminal Psychodynamics*, 1955, **1**, 866-897.

A large scale group therapy programme was organized at the California Medical Facility. This is a special prison for the treatment of offenders, especially the sexual ones. Almost 700 men (65-70 per cent. of prison inmates) in 85 groups

were meeting twice a week for several years. Their background usually revealed deprivation in childhood with resulting distortion of identification mechanisms, feeling of inadequacy and persecution, and 'basic distrust' as model of emotional relationships. Results are claimed to be encouraging. No statistical evidence presented, no control group.

T. G.

HECTOR J. RITEY : 'The Psychological Background of Recidivism', *Archives of Criminal Psychodynamics*, 1955, **1**, 898-907.

Recidivism is presented as a vicious circle perpetuated by a morbid fear of contact with reality. It is claimed that only deep psychotherapy can break this vicious circle.

T. G.

PSYCHOLOGY

MARCEL FRYM : 'The Treatment of Recidivists', *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1956, **47**, 1-7.

In discussing the employment of ex-criminals the Director of Criminological Research in the Hacker Foundation proposes the setting-up of an independent organization, tentatively called 'Character Underwriters' which, upon application by individual offenders, would provide a scientific study of the personality and record of the applicant. Every person accepted by 'Character Underwriters' would be under its continuous case-work supervision. The service would be financially self-supporting.

J. C. S.

ELEANOR T. GLUECK : 'Status of Prediction Studies', *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1956, **47**, 18-32.

This article was presented to the International Congress on Criminology, 1955. It describes current work using the Gluecks' methods on the prediction of recidivism and the detection of potential delinquents. An appendix is included listing the tables used in the Gluecks' previous publications on prediction.

J. C. S.

F. M. YOUNG : 'Responses of Juvenile Delinquents to the Thematic Apperception Test', *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1956, **88**, 251-259.

Administration of 16 TAT cards to 34 delinquent boys and 34 delinquent girls gave results which suggest that boys admire the father more than the mother, but see more good than bad in both parents. Girls appear to be more impressed by the bad traits in both parents, but especially by those in the mother. The mother is seen by boys and girls as the parent who enforces discipline, and it is from the mother that the child runs away. The matriarchal type of home seemed to predominate in the present study. The needs of the subject were suggested in such themes as succorance and/or love, heterosexual behaviour, aggressive behaviour, intragressive-dejection syndromes, desire for material possessions, achievement, and failure. Although 62.6 per cent. of the plots were unhappy, about one-third were changed to have happy endings. About 20 per cent. of the plots were unhappy both in plot and ending.

W. R. B.

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

JOHN C. LARSON : 'On Rehabilitating Chronic Traffic Offenders', *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1956, **47**, 46-50.

Safety research indicates that social and psychological factors are the primary causes of accidents. An analysis of research shows that the personal and social characteristics of criminals and delinquents also are typical of the majority of chronic traffic offenders, although the latter appear to possess these characteristics to a lesser degree. On the other hand current efforts at rehabilitation do not appear to be based on these observations.

J. C. S.

FRANK E. HARTUNG and MAURICE FLOCH : 'A Social-psychological Analysis of Prison Riots', *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1956, **47**, 51-57.

A greater number of prison riots occurred in 1952 than in any previous year though none occurred in a minimum security prison. A study suggests that there were two main types. First, there were those whose origin appears to have been mainly in what can be regarded as the historical causes of prison riots. Second, there were those originating mainly in a combination of certain penal advances and the nature of the maximum custody prison. The authors discuss in this paper the second type; they emphasize the effect of abolishing the semi-official inmate self-government with nothing to replace it.

J. C. S.

R. FIRTH : 'The Child and his Relationship to the Community', *International Child Welfare Review*, 1955, **IX**, 3, 123-136.

A reprint of a paper delivered to the W.H.O. Western Pacific Seminar on Mental Health in Childhood, 1953. The writer, a social anthropologist, discusses some of the most important issues in the problem of determining 'normative' standards, drawing illustrations from non-Western, anthropological material. The paper is broken down under the headings of cultural patterns and the child, marital patterns and their implications for child-care, patterns of authority, adoption, extended kinship, and the treatment of children, including feeding, weaning and punishments.

T. P. M. M.

C. H. GUNDRY and T. G. HUNTER : 'Mental Hygiene in Child Health Centres', *International Child Welfare Review*, 1955, **IX**, 137-145.

Two members of the Metropolitan Health Committee of Vancouver, B.C., question why mothers, of whom a high proportion are of good economic and educational standards, continue to attend clinics, when so much information which was originally disseminated by the clinics is widely possessed. The authors deduce that the mothers come, not so much for the free service available, as for advice, and perhaps more, though unconsciously, for reassurance. The clinics have been re-orientated to deal with the psychological aspects of child-care, and experiments made by bringing psychologists into the mother-nurse interview. Seeing, however, that the public health nurse is the key figure in the mental health

programme, efforts should be directed towards equipping her more fully for her task. Administrative needs, however, tend to restrict the nurse's time, and only about 20 per cent. is available for the child health programme, most of it being spent in a clinical setting.

T. P. M.M.

SOCIOLOGY

VERNON FOX and JOAN VOLAHAKIS: 'The Negro Offender in a Northern Industrial', *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1956, 46, 641-647.

The high proportion of Negro to white inmates in Michigan prisons led to this study of a random sample of 1,000 whites and 1,000 Negroes at Jackson prison. The authors find that the Negro offender in Michigan differs considerably from the white in terms of crimes committed. He is concentrated in and around Detroit. He differs also in type of marital behaviour, occupation, and intelligence. They suggest administrative changes necessary to deal with some of the problems of the Negro population.

J. C. S.

LLOYD E. OHLIN, HERMAN PIVEN and DONNELL M. PAPPENFORT: 'Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole', *N.P.P.A. Journal*, July 1956, 211-225.

This article is based on research carried out by a team from the Center for Education and Research in Corrections at the University of Chicago. It presents an extensive discussion of the relationship between work in the correctional field and the other forms of social case work, emphasizing the difficulties faced by workers with an 'orthodox' social work education who for the first time encounter authoritarian settings. The organization of correctional social work agencies, whose work is more likely to be subjected to publicity than that of other agencies, is likely to be reflected in an emphasis on public relations which may lead the caseworker to feel that his professional interests are being sacrificed for administrative considerations. Similarly the recruit is liable to be shocked by finding how much he has to work within limits set by the authority of the courts and the pressures of public opinion expressed in moral judgments. Another major difficulty is provided by the big caseloads customary in the correctional field. These problems are discussed primarily in relation to the 'generic' education of social workers.

The article referred to above is only one from an issue of the *N.P.P.A. Journal*, devoted to the subject of Training for Probation and Parole Work. J. P. M.

M. SMILANSKY: 'Community Youth Centres and Extended School Centres in Israel', *International Child Welfare Review*, 1956, X, 1, 20-28.

An extract from a working paper connected with a UNICEF Study. The tremendous influx of a diverse population since 1948 has been not the least of Israel's difficulties. The purposes of the Youth Centres include the integration of this new population into the Israeli community. Among the problems encountered has been that created by the widely varying standards of education in the immigrants' countries of origin.

T. P. M. M.

LAW

GERHARD O. W. MUELLER: 'Tort, Crime and the Primitive', *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1955, **46**, 303-332.

The aim of this paper is a re-evaluation of Max Weber's statements with regard to the primitive law of wrongs. The conclusion is that even most primitive criminal law does concern itself with the inner motivations and psychological attitudes of the culprit. Primitive law makes clear distinctions between crime and tort. Primitive tort law shows little concern for the motives of the wrongdoer. These conclusions are quite contrary to those reached by Max Weber and most nineteenth-century scholars that the primitive law of wrongs does not concern itself with psychological attitudes.

J. C. S.

HIS HONOUR JUDGE COLLS: 'Criminal Punishment', *The Law Times*, 1956, **221**, 5906.

A recapitulation of judicial arguments for retaining corporal punishment.

J. P. EDDY, Q.C.: 'Should the McNaghten Rules be Amended?', *The Law Times*, 1956, **222**, 18.

ANON: 'The Control of Prostitution', *The Solicitor*, 1956, **23**, 215-216.

W. J. B.

EDUCATION

J. T. WILSON: 'Class-room Life in the Approved School', *Approved Schools Gazette*, 1956, **50**, 4, 119-120.

Approved School classes differ importantly from those in ordinary day schools and might be better described as 'educational hospitals'. They enjoy small classes of 20, the advantages of which are obvious. It is essential that teachers must be emotionally stable and mature, for the most brilliant teacher cannot help immature and disturbed children if he lacks those qualities. The writer feels that there is a need for a specialist qualification for teaching in Approved Schools.

T. P. M. M.

W. RAEBURN: 'This Vile Custom', *Approved Schools Gazette*, 1956, **50**, 5, 160-169.

The Recorder of West Ham discusses a number of problems arising out of the prohibition of smoking to Approved School boys, especially when the masters are themselves smokers. He examines some of the practical difficulties in the enforcement of the rule and some of the ethical issues arising out of it.

T. P. M. M.

SEX

G. GARMANY: 'The Male Sex Offender', *Medical Press*, 1955, **234**, 320-323.

The chief forms of sexual offence committed by males are discussed, and certain illnesses are mentioned which may release homosexual behaviour. The question of criminal responsibility and possible changes in legislation are considered. The rôle of œstrogens in the treatment of sexual difficulties is briefly described.

W. R. B.

F. J. HACKER AND M. FRY: 'The Sexual Psychopath Act in Practice ; a Critical Discussion', *California Law Review*, **43**, 5, p. 766.

'Other Vices, other Crimes', *Iowa Law Review*, 1956, **41**, 3.

The phenomenon of anti-social conduct approached from a fresh angle.

W. J. B.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

SHELDON GLUECK was for many years Professor of Criminology, and is at present the first incumbent of the Roscoe Pound Professorship of Law, at the Harvard Law School. His works include, among others, 'Mental Disorder and the Criminal Law', 'Crime and Justice' (Lowell Lectures), 'The Nuremburg Trial and Aggressive War' and, with his wife Dr. Eleanor T. Glueck, 'Five Hundred Criminal Careers', 'One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents', 'Five Hundred Delinquent Women', 'Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency' and, most recently, 'Physique and Delinquency'.

MARSHALL B. CLINARD, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin; Fulbright Research Professor to Sweden, 1954-1955. Author of 'The Black Market: A Study of White Collar Crime' (Rinehart, 1952), and 'Sociology of Deviant Behaviour' (Rinehart, 1957).

GEORGE NEWTON is an Assistant Principal Probation Officer of the London Probation Service, and a part-time lecturer to the Applied Social Studies Course at the London School of Economics.

Contributors to the Symposium on 'Delinquency Areas': **W. J. H. SPROTT**, M.A., Professor of Philosophy, University of Nottingham; **JOHN BARRON MAYS**, M.A., Tutor in the Social Science Department, University of Liverpool; **T. P. M. MORRIS**, Ph.D., Lecturer in Social Administration, London School of Economics and Political Science; **JOHN C. SPENCER**, M.A., Ph.D., Director, Bristol Social Research Project.

The Journal of CRIMINAL LAW CRIMINOLOGY and POLICE SCIENCE

TIMELY SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

ON THE SUBJECT OF CRIME

ITS CAUSE,

DETECTION

AND PREVENTION

Bi-monthly; Annual subscription rate £3 per volume

RECENT ARTICLES INCLUDE:

Early Detection of Future Delinquents
Borkum Island Tragedy and Trial
Privileged Communications Between Husband and Wife:
Extension of the Privilege to Acts in Criminal Cases
Police Administrative Training
A Test Plate for Proportional Spacing Typewriter
Examination
Defense Detective

STANDARD FEATURES:

Criminal law notes and comments
Current notes
Book reviews
Police science technical and legal abstracts

PUBLISHED BY THE WILLIAMS & WILKINS CO. U.S.A. FOR THE NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Distributed in the U.K. and Commonwealth by

Baillière, Tindall & Cox Ltd., 7-8 Henrietta St., London, W.C.2

The International Journal of Social Psychiatry

THE FIRST QUARTERLY JOURNAL IN THIS FIELD

Vol. II. *AUTUMN* 1956.

This issue publishes articles by: Ørnulv Ødegard, Norway, 'The Incidence of Psychoses in Various Occupations'; I. H. Abdelhalim, Egypt, 'Factors Related to the Attitudes of Adults towards Relations Between the Sexes in a Specific Culture'; Patricia Grygier, Great Britain, 'The Personality of Student Nurses'; Toby B. Bieber, U.S.A., 'The Emphasis on the Individual in a Psychoanalytic Group Therapy'; O. W. Fonseca and J. W. Vineberg, Canada, 'Emergent Social Structure Among Short-Term Psychiatric Patients'; P. Sivadon, France, 'Adaption Factors in the Work of Mental Patients'; Reports and Reviews.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION (*Four Issues*)

£2 or \$8 for Hospitals, Libraries, Firms, Government Offices, etc.
£1 5s. or \$5 for individual subscribers who certify that the Journal is for their personal use.

ALL ENQUIRIES TO BE ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY

The International Journal of Social Psychiatry

9 FELLOWS ROAD, LONDON N.W.3, ENGLAND

The British Journal of PSYCHOLOGY

EDITED BY JAMES DREVER

VOL. XLVII PART 4

NOVEMBER 1956

20s. NET \$ 3.50

Alastair Heron. A two-part personality measure for use as a research criterion.

J. G. Ingham. Some experiments on Pavlov's theory of suggestion.

Eunice Belbin. The effects of propaganda on recall, recognition and behaviour. II. The conditions which determine the response to propaganda.

N. E. Loveless. Display-control relationships on circular and linear scales.

Jean G. Wallace. Some studies of perception in relation to age.

Bernard R. Singer. An experimental inquiry into the concept of perceptual defence.

Publications recently received

Other publications received

*The subscription price per volume, payable in advance, is
60s. (or \$10) net (post free).*

Subscriptions may be sent to any bookseller or to the

Cambridge University Press

BENTLEY HOUSE, EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, N.W.1

JUST PUBLISHED

Tredgold's Textbook of Mental Deficiency

NINTH EDITION by *R. F. Tredgold, M.A., M.D., D.P.M.,
Physician-in-Charge, Department of Psychological Medicine,
University College Hospital, London, and K. Soddy, M.D.,
D.P.M. of the same department.*

This edition, prepared by Dr. R. F. Tredgold, who assisted his father in the previous edition, and Dr. K. Soddy, preserves the clinical descriptions that have made the book noteworthy, but considerable re-writing of the rest of the material has been undertaken in the light of recent research and modern changes in psychological theory. A major innovation is the inclusion of a chapter on the defective's relations with his family, reflecting the much increased insight resulting from current family social case work.

An essential reference book to all concerned with amentia in its clinical and social aspects. *Price 40s., Postage 1s. 6d. extra*

Baillière, Tindall and Cox

7-8 HENRIETTA STREET, LONDON, W.C.2.